

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 920, Vol. 35.

June 14, 1873.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE SPANISH ANARCHY.

THE progress of disorder in Spain corresponds with painful fidelity to the anticipations of prudent politicians. The first day of the Republic was the least gloomy; and the gathering of clouds has since been uninterrupted. The shadow of legal right which was preserved for a time disappeared when the Ministers, at the dictation of the mob which had previously remodelled the Cabinet, dissolved the Permanent Committee of the Cortes. Even the eloquent assurances of CASTELAR became fainter and fainter with the dissolution of military discipline and of civil obedience. In defiance of probability and experience the Ministers affected to hope that a Constituent Cortes would confer solidity and permanence on the new institutions. The more rational leaders probably saw with alarm the election of an exclusively Republican Assembly representing only the least enlightened and most violent section of the community. On the eve of the meeting of the Cortes, the Government, without a pretence of right, endeavoured to earn a cheap popularity by abolishing all ranks of nobility and titles of honour; but the original promoters of the revolution were already convinced that it had passed beyond their control. At their first sitting the Cortes decreed with ridiculous unanimity the establishment of that Federal Republic which is nevertheless as yet only a name. From that moment the supposed representatives of the people indicated the estimate of their own mission by an incessant exhibition of utter incapacity and shameless disorder. That the Ministers should resign their offices to the new Assembly might be regarded as a decent form; but in a country which retained any instinct of practical Government, they ought to have been immediately reinstated in their places. A knot of politicians which had taken upon itself to overthrow the Constitution, and which had exercised unquestioned power for several months, was morally bound to continue its services as long as the country required its aid. It had already been rumoured that CASTELAR was weary of his irksome task; and, to the general surprise, FIGUERAS also refused to return to office. Having turned the head of the ship to the breakers, and set all sail, the crew took to the boats; and probably their desertion accounts in some degree for the intemperate violence of the subsequent proceedings. The first quarrel arose on the question whether the new Ministers should be appointed singly or by a list; and then the Cortes fiercely contested the mode of election by open voting or by ballot. The first chief of the Cabinet was Señor PI Y MARGALL, one of the few respectable leaders of the Republican party; but in twenty-four hours he found it necessary to resign, and FIGUERAS once more attempted to form a Government. The first Cabinet appointed by the Cortes lasted long enough to produce a Budget, which consisted chiefly in a proposal to issue 20,000,000*l.* of an irredeemable paper currency with forced circulation. Revolution, like a watch running down, accomplishes its circles faster and faster, and modern imitations revolve in the familiar groove. The three months' old Republic in Spain is already reduced to dependence on *assignats*, except indeed that Spanish banknotes have not even, like the currency of the first French Revolution, a mass of national property behind them. The opponents of the scheme could only suggest the alternative of a forced loan; and, according to a scarcely intelligible statement, the Ministers themselves condemned the project of their colleague. Señor ORENSE tendered his resignation of the Presidency over an uncontrollable Assembly; and by the latest account PI Y MARGALL was once more chief Minister, while FIGUERAS had followed SAGASTA, ZORRILLA, and SERRANO into exile. The demagogues of the streets are already exhorting the sovereign people to supersede the authority of the Cortes, and it is not

improbable that within a week the faction which corresponds to the Paris Commune may have succeeded to office. It is in Spain apparently that the democratic Helot will furnish the most graphic illustration of the blessings of universal suffrage.

As might be expected, the Carlists profit by the prevailing anarchy in the prosecution of their petty warfare. General NOUVILAS, commanding the Republican army in the North has been unable to redeem his hasty pledge of overwhelming the insurgents by the beginning of June. In most of the reported skirmishes the Carlists seem to have obtained the advantage; but their victories display even more conspicuously than their defeats the insignificance of their resources. Notwithstanding the helplessness of their enemies, the Royalists have occupied no considerable town, and they are evidently unable to place a regular army in the field. Their hopes of the adhesion of disaffected officers have hitherto been disappointed, and there seems reason to believe that the Government troops incline, as far as they have any political leaning, to the cause of Don ALFONSO, son of Queen ISABELLA. An obscure mutiny at Grenada is supposed to have been promoted by Alfonsists; but it is for the present difficult to ascertain the objects of the different civil and military factions. In some places disturbances have arisen from causes unconnected with political objects. A body of Republican volunteers at Aranjuez was assaulted, in consequence of an insult offered to a woman, by the inhabitants armed with sticks; and one of their number was killed on the spot. The troops in the garrison of Madrid are guilty of frequent acts of insubordination; and their mutinous disposition is of course ascribed to the machinations of Carlist agents. The most serious case of mutiny which has yet occurred is the revolt of a portion of the troops stationed in Catalonia against General VELARDE. The pretext of the outbreak was the appointment of an unpopular captain who was rejected by his battalion with shouts of devotion to the Federal Republic. General VELARDE was forced to save himself by flight, though it is asserted that a portion of his force has remained faithful to its colours. The local government of Barcelona, which has on more than one occasion favoured military insubordination, appears in the present instance to side with the General against the mutineers. It seems that a deputation with reinforcements has left Barcelona to join VELARDE, and possibly the revolted troops may for the present be recalled to a sense of duty. Their clamorous attachment to the Federal Republic is founded on an interpretation of the phrase which probably accounts for any popularity which the new institutions may enjoy. To its partisans in the army, as in the country and the Cortes, the Federal Republic represents neither a combination of States nor a harmonious organization of local and central government, but unbounded license to every man to do what he likes. General VELARDE violated the principles of Federal Republicanism by appointing an unpopular captain of a company, and consequently the Federal Republicans under his command summarily dismissed their General. It would be interesting to ascertain whether CASTELAR still believes in the fine phrases which he learned from MAZZINI, or which he adorned for himself with the local colouring of Spanish Federalism. The whole organization of society appears to be crumbling to ruin since the doctrine of disobedience has been acknowledged as the rule of political practice. It was the pride of the Republican minority to render no voluntary submission to established authorities; and now the uncompromising faction refuses, with better reason, to acknowledge the control of rulers who are themselves revolutionary upstarts. There are without doubt patriots in Spain, including perhaps in their numbers some of the late Ministers, who must witness with pain and indignation the collapse of society, but, while

authority has been fatally weakened, and while loyalty has for the time disappeared, the ultimate resort of material force is at present unavailable. In all probability Spain will fall from bad to worse, until a disciplined force under a capable leader has emerged from the chaos of civil conflicts. A military despotism may restore order for a time; but the whole process of political improvement will have once more to begin from the beginning. No political party in Spain is exempt from the guilt of having deliberately or unconsciously contributed to the overthrow of liberty and order. SERRANO and PRIM committed a pardonable error in dethroning a Queen whose political and personal conduct was scandalously discreditable. The assassin who murdered PRIM inflicted the next blow on the prosperity of Spain; and the ungenerous and foolish opposition of SERRANO and the Moderate party to King AMADEO prepared the way for the miserable Republic which calls itself Federal.

The extreme faction of Madrid is demanding through its newspapers another armed revolution. It might have been thought that the passion for anarchy had satiated itself, but perhaps those who love rebellion on its own account may fear that, if the present opportunity is lost, there will no longer be a Government to overthrow. According to some reports the obscure persons who have within the last week succeeded one another in office have thought of the ingenious plan of distributing among the peasantry the estates of great proprietors. In this way it is supposed that a force might be created which would be able and willing to resist the Carlist incursions. The imbecile wickedness of the dominant faction exceeds all the hopes or fears of its enemies. Before the present cycle of revolution began, Spain, notwithstanding the defects of the Government, was rapidly advancing in material prosperity, and the discontent which existed was mainly confined to the army, the Court, and a small number of professional politicians. The Republicans, first by their opposition to more orderly Governments, and chiefly during their own administration of public affairs, have succeeded in impairing all securities for life and property, so that a large part of the more respectable population has taken refuge in foreign countries. For the evils which folly and ambition have inflicted on the country there is absolutely no compensation. The Government at Madrid, if indeed there is a Government, has neither popularity nor power; and when it is overthrown by some ignoble street riot, its unknown members will be supplanted by representatives of a still lower social stratum. The most conclusive condemnation of the Federal Republic is that, in the opinion of some political observers, the Carlists have for the first time since the disturbance of the old law of succession a possible chance of triumph. Although their efforts in the field are petty and desultory, an absolute monarch would be preferred to the odious and degrading tyranny of the mob of Madrid and Barcelona. A movement in favour of the rival branch of the BOURBONS would probably be more acceptable to the better classes; but in the present circumstances only a military leader could even attempt the re-establishment of order; and SERRANO, who is perhaps the least unpopular of Spanish generals, is an exile from his country. There is some consolation in the knowledge that the three months' reign of philanthropy and rhetoric is at an end. Political conflict in Spain has reduced itself to the elementary form of a mere comparison of material forces. The mob has beaten the orators; but it will be crushed in its turn as soon as it encounters a disciplined force.

MR. FORSTER AND THE EDUCATION ACT.

THE Elementary Education Act Amendment Bill, as described by Mr. FORSTER, is exactly what it professes to be. It amends, but it does not extend. The arrangements for the compulsory provision of schools remain as before; the arrangements for sending children to school remain as before. School Boards are not to be set up everywhere; attendance is not to be enforced everywhere. As regards the first of these points, taken by itself, the omission is consistent with the spirit of the original Act and with the repeated declarations of the VICE-PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL. The question whether School Boards ought to be made universal may be differently decided according as it is looked at on its own merits or in reference to compulsory attendance. The Education League wish to see School Boards established in every school district on both these grounds. They wish, that is to say, that School Board schools should

be provided, not merely, as they are under the Act, in places where voluntary effort has not provided any efficient school, but in places where voluntary effort has provided efficient schools. School Board schools on this theory are to be the rivals, and not merely the supplements, of voluntary schools. It is evident that to have made School Boards universal for this purpose would have been to introduce a radical alteration into the Education Act. The leading principle of that Act was to arrive at a really national system of education by making full use of the partial systems already in being. Wherever voluntary effort had provided sufficient schools, or could be induced to provide them within a reasonable time, it was allowed to hold its ground. To set up a School Board school side by side with voluntary schools created in answer to the invitation of the Government, within three years from that invitation having been issued, and to do this with the avowed purpose of killing off the voluntary schools by means of the close neighbourhood of the School Board schools, would have gone very near to breaking faith with the persons who, accepting the Government assurance that rates might be made unnecessary by adequate subscriptions, had provided sufficient schools out of their own pockets. Parliament, we know, can make no binding contracts, and if a Bill making this change had been introduced and passed this Session, the managers of voluntary schools would have had no strict right to complain. But Ministers can make contracts binding at all events upon themselves, and the managers of voluntary schools would have had good right to complain if such a Bill had been passed at the instance of the present Government.

No breach of faith, however, would have been involved in the universal establishment of School Boards for the purpose of enforcing attendance at school, supposing that it could have been shown that no other machinery would effect this object equally well. In the omission from the Bill of all reference to this aspect of the question, as well as in the highly significant reference to it in Mr. FORSTER's speech, the influence of the events of the spring may be clearly traced. "As regards compulsory attendance," said Mr. FORSTER, "I have personally the same opinion as that which I expressed in debate last year. I have not concealed from my colleagues my conviction that direct compulsion might be safely made the general law for England and Wales." Mr. FORSTER did not go on to say, but it is not difficult to supply the gap, that his colleagues thought that, however safe it would be for England and Wales, it would not be equally safe for the present Cabinet. Whenever compulsory attendance is made universal—and after the precedent of the Scotch Education Bill the change is certain to be introduced some day—it will probably be made so at the cost of some hard fighting in Parliament, and a languid Government with, upon this question, only a divided party to lean on, is not inclined for hard fighting. Perhaps compulsory education might have been as good a question to go to the country upon as any that could easily be found, but to make up its mind to go to the country at all demands more energy than the Government now seems to possess. Certainly, if it prefers to be carried to the country rather than to go to it, it is probably well advised in keeping clear of compulsory education. It is fair, however, to say that there are two considerations which may well have weighed with the Cabinet in determining to leave the question alone. The first is, that whatever be the nature of the machinery by which attendance is to be enforced, the creation of it must throw large additional burdens on the rates, and in the present temper of the House of Commons on this subject it is not difficult to say how it would have received a proposal having this effect. A good number of persons who now talk cheerily enough in favour of compulsory education might have changed their note when the financial part of the question came up for discussion, and it is possible that a motion not to go on with the Bill until after some settlement has been arrived at in the matter of local taxation might have found unexpected favour even on the Liberal benches. The second consideration is that the establishment of direct compulsion as a general law would be very much easier if the religious difficulty were out of the way. As things stand, and are likely to stand for some time to come, the only schools in many districts will be voluntary schools. Compulsory attendance would therefore mean compulsory attendance at Denominational schools under the protection of the conscience clause. With proper safeguards in the way of inspection, we believe that this is a sufficient protection; but the Education League would certainly not accept it as such. It is highly probable that the next election will convince these gentlemen that their

power in the country is very much less than they have till lately supposed it to be, and if their weakness in the House of Commons can be shown to be an accurate measure of their weakness in the constituencies, it will be very much easier to settle the question of compulsory attendance at school.

The positive provisions of the Bill, so far as they were explained on Thursday, are mainly two. DENISON's Act is to be made compulsory instead of permissive; and the payment of school fees is to be transferred from the School Boards to the Board of Guardians. At present the Guardians may provide for the education of the children of outdoor paupers if they think fit, but they must not make that provision a condition of relief. Mr. FORSTER proposes to repeal DENISON's Act, and to enact that where outdoor relief is given to children between five and thirteen years of age, or to their parents, it shall be a condition of such relief that elementary education in reading, writing, and arithmetic shall be provided for them, and the Guardians shall give such further relief as may be necessary for that purpose. We do not imagine that this clause will meet with any opposition. It is a matter of the most obvious common sense that in relieving adult paupers care should be taken not to breed up a new generation of paupers to take their place. But to accustom the child of a pauper from babyhood to be maintained out of the rates, while denying him the education which may give him hereafter the wish and the power to maintain himself, is the best way to ensure his becoming a pauper as soon as he is old enough to make a choice for himself. As the law stands, parsimonious Boards of Guardians need not provide for the children of out-door paupers being educated, and even Boards of Guardians, whose wisdom extends beyond pence, are bound to relieve a parent even if he refuses to send his child to school. There are at least, Mr. FORSTER says, 200,000 children of school age whose parents are outdoor paupers, so that the effect of the new provision will be to extend compulsory education to a large proportion of the children who most stand in need of it. The vexed question of the 25th Clause of the Education Act is dealt with, in essentials, in the way which we have all along advocated. Wherever the parent of a child required by the by-laws of a School Board to attend school satisfies the Guardians that he is unable from poverty to pay the school fees, the Guardians are to make him such allowance as will enable him to pay them; but this allowance is not to be granted or refused on condition of the child attending any public elementary school other than such as may be selected by the parent. Mr. FORSTER asked the House to observe that the new clause does not enact that fees are to be paid to school managers out of the rates, but simply that help shall be given out of the rates to parents who without such help would not be able to obey the law. It is to be feared that the Education League will take no account of this distinction, and Mr. DIXON has in fact already sounded the note of fierce hostility to the Ministerial proposal. They will want to trace out the expenditure of the relief given, and will grudge the outlay of the least portion of it in sending children to Denominational schools. Why they are not equally precise about the expenditure of relief given for other purposes—why, for example, they do not make it a grievance that one old pauper buys her tea from a Roman Catholic grocer, while another buys her snuff from a tobacconist in connexion with the Congregational Union, is hard to say. But they are likely, if this analogy is driven home, to arrive at consistency by an absurd extension of their theory, rather than by a rational abandonment of it. It has long been evident that upon this point there is no room for compromise. So long as voluntary schools hold their present place in our educational system, the liberty given to a parent by the 25th Clause to send his child to the school he likes best, whenever there is more than one which gives efficient elementary education, is essential to the successful working of compulsion; and though the Education League may wish to dispense with elementary education altogether rather than have it on these terms, the country is not prepared to go with them. That Mr. FORSTER has maintained the distinction between paupers and parents requiring educational relief is to be regretted. It is an unmeaning distinction at the best, and it may easily become a mischievous one. Some of the worst evils attending it, however, will be removed by the Guardians being made the vehicle through which the relief is administered. It will be their business to determine whether the plea made out for it is genuine, and they will have a large practical experience to guide them in arriving at a conclusion.

FRENCH FINANCE.

THE new Government in France starts with one great and incontestable advantage, for it can at once get credit for wisdom and patriotism by merely avoiding the financial heresies of M. THIERS. Last summer everything was sacrificed to the one great object of floating on satisfactory terms an enormous loan. In order that it might be floated, M. THIERS had to be allowed to govern as he pleased, and to shape the financial policy of the country after his own fashion. He had two special fancies to which he adhered, until, for the sake of political peace, those who most clearly saw the blunders he was making assented to what he proposed. He was bent on freeing France from all Treaties of Commerce whatever, and he was resolved that a large portion of the annual revenue should be derived from taxes on raw materials. There was at no time any point on which he bestowed so much incessant attention, or to carry which he worked so cleverly and manœuvred so adroitly, as that of taxation of raw materials. He assured the Assembly over and over again that these taxes would produce four millions sterling. It was in vain that he was asked to explain how he proposed to get this revenue while existing treaties still permitted the free import of some at least of the raw materials that were to be taxed; and a special Committee in vain reported that, after examining the question to the best of their ability, they had come to the conclusion that the country would scarcely get a farthing of available revenue from the taxes on raw materials. M. THIERS replied that he was M. THIERS, that he knew from the teaching of his inner consciousness that four millions was the sum that would be produced, and that this was the exact sum necessary to balance the Budget. If the country is to be cleared of the foreigner there must be a big loan, he kept on repeating; if there is to be a big loan, the Budget is to be balanced; if the Budget is to be balanced, raw materials must be taxed. The Assembly listened, did not believe a word he said, and voted as he wished. Indirectly this vote produced the effect intended. Lenders did not accept M. THIERS's statements and suppose that the Budget would be balanced by taxes on raw materials, but they saw in the readiness of the Assembly to support the Government of the day on financial questions, even against the opinion of nine-tenths of the voters, an assurance that France would in some way or other see that its Budget was balanced. Now that sufficient time has elapsed to ascertain what has been the practical effect of the scheme of taxation to which M. THIERS clung so fondly, it is found that all his expectations have been deceived. The taxes on raw materials, which were intended to produce four millions, have not produced anything. The whole scheme is a total failure. The expected revenue from other sources has also proved deficient, and the new Government, which finds a natural pleasure in revealing all that its adversaries must have long mourned over in secret, announces that there is a deficit of eight millions sterling. To provide for a deficit of eight millions sterling is generally as melancholy a duty as a Government can be called on to discharge. But in this case there is much to make the operation pleasant. The new Ministry can clearly cast the burden of discredit on the shoulders of their predecessors, and every financial step they take is also a step towards the great result of lowering the reputation of M. THIERS.

The new Government is remarkably strong in financial ability. M. MAGNE was twice Finance Minister under the Empire, and the confidence he won in that position is generally recognized as one of the main causes of the great rise in the price of the public funds during the last fortnight. M. DE LA BOUILLERIE, the Minister of Commerce, was the author of the Financial Report of 1871, and was the Reporter on the Budget of 1872. Both Ministers voted against the taxes on raw materials, and abstained from voting for the Bill to abolish the English Treaty of Commerce. Now, therefore, that they are prepared to reverse the policy of their predecessors, they come forward perfectly unfettered, and command the attention due to men who thoroughly understand the business they are taking in hand. On Saturday a deputy, acting no doubt in concert with the Government, proposed that the taxes on raw materials should not be levied until compensatory duties could be imposed on all foreign goods. This was, in effect, to suggest that the whole of M. THIERS's peculiar system of finance should remain in abeyance until all existing Treaties of Commerce have expired. The MINISTER OF COMMERCE replied that, as to the taxes on raw materials, it was impossible any longer to regard them as a source of revenue; and that for financial purposes the law of 1872 must be regarded as a dead letter. But the proper treatment of the Treaties of Commerce presented some difficulty, for negotia-

tions had been carried on by the late Government with Italy, England, and Belgium, and the new Government was not prepared, without further consideration, to state how far it found itself pledged by what had been done. Meanwhile a Committee of the Assembly appointed to inquire into commercial affairs has made a suggestion which, if it could be carried out, would remove many difficulties. It is, that the Treaties of 1860, without being formally renewed, should be put practically into operation by what the Committee term "tacit reconduction." Thus the whole of M. THIERS's work would be swept away at one stroke; and although it is not known whether the Ministry will adopt the suggestion, the MINISTER of COMMERCE has taken an important step in this direction by announcing his readiness to abrogate the new Merchant Shipping Act, by which a heavy differential duty was imposed on English vessels. This Act, which was one of the chief gems of M. THIERS's Protectionist policy, was intended to give new life to the languishing commercial marine of France; but practically it has had a totally opposite effect. It has thrown French trade into confusion, it has diverted commerce from French to Dutch and Belgian ports, and, while it has produced great irritation among English shipowners, it has conferred no benefit on the owners of French vessels. The Minister, therefore, had the satisfaction of at once taking a step which he could rely upon as being regarded by England as a friendly act, and at the same time gratifying the French commercial public. In recurring to a more liberal financial policy he will have no opposition to fear from his habitual adversaries. The Left, when they supported M. THIERS in his fanciful schemes, openly avowed that they considered him totally wrong, but were prepared for temporary political purposes to support him whether he was wrong or right.

But the deficit of eight millions remains, and the first idea of the Ministry seems to have been to procure what is wanting by a new tax on business transactions and by an increase of the Registration duties. Formidable objections may be urged against looking to either of these two sources. To increase the Registration duties is simply to add to the existing heavy burdens on land; and although it would be equitable to make the landed classes bear their share of new taxation if traders were to be subjected to new taxes, the justice of the scheme would scarcely reconcile the grumbling small proprietors, in whom the new Government hopes to find its surest allies, to pay more than is now exacted from them. The tax on business transactions has almost every possible fault that a tax can have. It would be as inquisitorial as the Income-tax, and it would fall most unfairly on different sets of traders. What is proposed is that a tax of one per cent. should be levied, not on the net profits, but on the gross transactions of traders. The oftener, therefore, that a man turned over his money, the more he would pay to the State, although his profit on each transaction might be very small. Nothing could be more certain to discourage commercial activity and enterprise, as the accidental nature of his business, and not his available yearly revenue, would determine how much a trader would have to pay. So difficult is it in the present state of France to invent new taxes, that attention has been naturally directed to a method of avoiding altogether the necessity of new taxation. The State has arranged to repay the money lent it by the Bank of France by annual instalments of eight millions sterling. If the State did not pay in the coming financial year this instalment, there would be eight millions less to provide from taxation, and thus the Budget would be balanced without a farthing of new taxation being requisite. This mode of getting out of the difficulty is delightfully simple, and the attraction of diverting these eight millions from their appointed object is so great that inventive financiers are always proposing schemes for turning this fund to account in their own fashion. M. POUYER-QUETIER, for example, has recently suggested that it might be very conveniently used for paying off the purchase-money of the Eastern railways; and as the Government pays only one per cent. to the Bank, while it pays six per cent. interest to every one else, there is evidently no end to the ways in which it might be shown that the State would reap an immediate gain if it postponed the repayment of its debt to the Bank. But to propose such a postponement is really to take a very serious step. Until its debt is repaid, the Bank cannot resume cash payments; until cash payments are resumed, France is cut off from a most important portion of commercial business. There used to be two centres of exchange operations in Europe, London and Paris; but since the war of 1870 exchange business has been altogether diverted from Paris, and London has become the one centre of Euro-

pean operations, as the nature of their business requires that dealers should be certain of being paid, if they need it, in gold. It is not, therefore, surprising that the Bank of France should regard with the greatest regret the loss of the important position it once held, and should insist that no sacrifice can be too great to enable Paris to become once more the rival of London. Men of great financial ability are sure to urge this view in the Assembly, and no one could be better aware than M. MAGNE how much he is abandoning if he defers the resumption of cash payments to an indefinite period. Should the Ministry make the proposal, it will probably carry it, for the only alternative is to invent new taxes, and this is beyond the power of an Opposition. But it is certain that the proposal would be made with the greatest reluctance on the part of the Government, and would be accepted by the Assembly with the severe disapproval of those in its ranks best qualified to judge of the ultimate consequences of what was being done.

THE SCOTCH CHURCHES.

THE Assemblies of the Scotch Churches would, it might reasonably be thought, present a very pleasing spectacle of active and successful Protestantism. The great mass of the nation is of one faith, and that faith is endeared to it by history, tradition, and the remembrances of great triumphs over great difficulties. In everything that elsewhere is considered to form the basis of a Christian communion the vast bulk of Scotchmen are absolutely agreed. The population consists of a million and a half Presbyterians of the Established Church, half as many Presbyterians of the Free Church, and nearly half a million United Presbyterians. Outside the Presbyterian fold there are three hundred thousand Roman Catholics, and less than one hundred thousand Episcopalian. There is no tenet that has the slightest connexion with theology or spiritual life as to which the divisions of the Presbyterian fold are at variance. What separates them is that the United Presbyterians wish the Church to have nothing to do with the State, the Free Church wishes the State to assist the Church, provided it does so on terms of which the Church approves, and the Established Church likes to be connected with the State, and is perfectly content to have the prestige of cordial relations with the Crown, and as much in the way of endowments as it can get. In spite, however, of their agreeing on ninety-nine points out of a hundred in which Christians feel warm interest, their discord as to the hundredth point is enough to develop all the vigour and fury of theological bitterness and theological hatred. It is perhaps because they agree in so much that they hate and revile each other so fiercely in the narrow field of their disagreement. The main note or mark of Scotch Presbyterianism is its intense parochialism. It is the perfect flowering of religious beadle-dom. The meetings of the Assemblies ring with the utterances of alternate bombast and scurrility which are so familiar a feature in the proceedings of vestries and parish Boards. There is no measure or sense of proportion in anything that is said. Any departure from the view of the speaker is spoken of as if it showed a depravity sufficient to doom to destruction a world in which such opinions can be held. Men of the most earnest sincerity and the most amiable temper seem to bid good-by to common sense altogether when they come within the deteriorating influence of an Assembly. Dr. DUFF, who has given almost the whole of a long and successful life to missionary work in India, has been acting as the Moderator of the Free Church, and a man who has seen many men and things, and who has won fame for himself and his Church by his labours abroad, might be expected to be a little reasonable when he came to preside over the meetings of his brethren at home. But Dr. DUFF is no more able to resist the demoralizing atmosphere of a General Assembly than any one else. In an opening address which filled twenty-one columns of a local journal, he touched on every subject that interested him. Among other things, he announced to his hearers that an event had recently happened which was the most critical, the most grave, and the most appalling event in the history of the human race since the fall of ADAM. Persons not accustomed to the language of speakers in General Assemblies would never guess, if they guessed all the rest of their lives, what this awful event really was. It was the election of a Mr. RIGG as a member of the School Board of Edinburgh. Nor was Dr. DUFF, to bestow on whom the title of Moderator is the only trace of humour in the proceedings, less aspiring in his language when commenting on the behaviour of the brethren over whom he was presiding. They

relieved their feelings by freely hissing the speeches of those with whom they disagreed. This, the Moderator informed them, reminded him of MILTON's hissing Devils, in what he euphemistically called "a remarkable place." No one seems to have thought there was anything odd in this. They were met in General Assembly, and therefore it seemed to them perfectly natural that they should hiss any fellow-labourer in the spiritual vineyard whose opinions on the minutest point of ecclesiastical arrangements differed from theirs, and that in return their President should tell them that they made him feel as if he were in MILTON's Hell.

A story is told that at one of these meetings a speaker remarked that the speeches of those who preceded him reminded him of his wife's tea, which was very hot and very weak. This description gives a not inaccurate, although perhaps too complimentary, impression of the speeches made at a very excited and stormy meeting of the Free Church Assembly held a few days ago. There was no tea at all in most of these outpourings. It was all undiluted hot water. Speaker after speaker rose, and so intense was the interest excited that the Free Church was on the very brink of breaking up on the point at issue; and yet any one outside the communion might read columns of these speeches as reported, and fail to gain the slightest clue as to what it was that formed the subject of quarrel. It was something so very small that it could not be put into intelligible language. And yet the quarrel was carried on at a white heat, and passion seemed destined to triumph over reason, if there was any reason to triumph over, when all of a sudden a compromise was suggested which appears totally unmeaning, and then all the Assembly declared itself happy and satisfied, and the Moderator declared that there had been a special interposition of Divine Grace to avert disruption, and prayer was offered up in thankfulness for a great deliverance. Up to a certain point the question is not wholly unintelligible. As the Established Church is rather larger in number than the two other Presbyterian Churches, and as both of these agree in thinking that the Erastianism of the Established Church is one of the most frightful things on earth, it occurred to many leaders of the two dissentient bodies that, if they united, they might do more to hurt the Established Church than they could do singly. Accordingly, for nine years there has been a movement in this direction, and the time seemed to have arrived to carry it out so far as might be practicable. But there was a minority in the Free Church which abhorred the thought of joining so dangerous a body as the United Presbyterians; and this minority threatened that, if they were outvoted, they would appeal to the Courts of Law, and claim that, as they wished for no change, all the property of the Free Church should be handed over to them as the true representatives of the communion. As the whole basis of the Free Church is its protest against the temporal Courts having jurisdiction in spiritual matters, there was something supremely audacious in this threat. But then it seemed as if the law was likely to be on the side of these illogical disputants, and it would have been an absurd termination of an attempt to enlarge the borders of the Free Church if all its possessions had passed into the hands of a minority. The promoters of union were therefore obliged to succumb, and they did this under the veil of a compromise which is totally unintelligible. This does not, indeed, impair the effect of a compromise which is merely a means of concealing defeat, and which may answer its purpose perfectly well although no one understands it. But the state of mind in which such a compromise could be accepted after so much previous opposition had raged an hour or two before is strongly characteristic. It is now arranged that, if a Free Church congregation chooses to call a United Presbyterian minister, the Presbytery shall pronounce that this call is regular and sufficient, and shall send him some special Free Church documents of which he need take no notice, but in which his silence is to be taken as implying that he agrees, and then he may minister to the Free Church congregation that wishes for him. It had previously been proposed that under similar circumstances the Presbytery should sustain the call, and this was pronounced to be so detestable a proposal as to necessitate the disruption of the Church on the part of those who perceived its enormity. The disruption seemed inevitable, and the minority had already hired a public building in which to take up their new quarters when fortunately the dinner-hour arrived. During this happy interval a conciliatory member was prompted, as the Moderator thinks, by a special interposition to suggest that the Presbytery should not sustain the call, but pronounce it sufficient. Directly those magic words were uttered the spirit of peace entered into every breast. Brothers

fell blessing and melting into brotherly arms, and all was sweetness, harmony, and rapture. How this happened it is hopeless to attempt to inquire; it is more easy to enter into the feelings of one of the ardent spirits of the minority who told his congregation on the succeeding Sabbath that on reflection he could not be satisfied, that a proper building had been actually hired, and that he was of opinion that the disruption ought to have taken place.

The Assemblies of the Established Church are much more decorous, although parochialism is tolerably rampant there also. We gather from the records of recent meetings that the Church is fairly flourishing; that it at least holds its own; that it collects and spends a considerable amount of money; and that it is especially anxious for the conversion of the Jews. This was all set forth with the usual adornments, and in the usual metaphoric language. The Church was under the waves, but floating on them; beleaguered, but ready to unmask its own powerful batteries; and, in short, capable of being pictured under any images of combined adversity and success. But what really took up almost the whole time and absorbed almost the whole interest of the Assembly was a discussion of the case of Dr. WALLACE, who has a church in Edinburgh, and who has lately been appointed by the Crown to a chair in the University of Edinburgh. With the habitual injustice of theological enemies, some of those who resented his appointment as a Professor thought that they could deal him a side blow by raking up expressions which he was said to have used in the pulpit, but of which no notice had been taken until he had gained promotion. The chief allegation seems to have been that Dr. WALLACE had applied the terms "fickle, lawless, and fidgety" to the DEITY as conceived in the popular Scotch theology. But there can be nothing heretical in giving a mistaken account of other people's opinions, and it was heresy with which Dr. WALLACE was charged. At the same time, if such expressions were used in the pulpit, no greater proof could be given of the deep-seated parochialism of the Scotch ecclesiastical mind. Liberalism may be as parochial as anything else, and nothing can be in worse taste than offensive, exaggerated expressions from the pulpit intended to hold up to ridicule the opinions of ordinary believers. The Assembly had finally the good sense to put a stop to the vague proceedings against Dr. WALLACE, and to declare that if people wished to attack him they must do so in a regular manner, and prove what they asserted. There is always some kind of moderation and good sense and perception of what justice requires in a Church that is connected with the State, and the decision of the older Assembly shines by contrast with the furious babble of its younger rival about sustained and sufficient calls. But it is impossible not to see that the parochialism of Presbyterianism must in the long run destroy it in a country which, outside religious affairs, is making progress so rapidly as Scotland. One significant symptom of this is that the Established Church cannot, as its recent Reports show, get a sufficient number of candidates for the ministry. Able young men cannot in these days feel much attraction for such arenas as General Assemblies; and the laity, as it moves forward, will gradually come to regard these exhibitions of clerical thought and temper with a mixture of pity and contempt.

THE GOVERNMENT OF COMBAT.

M. BEULÉ seems destined to be the evil genius of the Duke of BROGLIE's Ministry. His first Circular to the prefects went as far as it was possible to go with decency in the way of corrupting public opinion. In England the issue of such instructions would have been regarded as tantamount to an admission that the majority in the Assembly is not supplemented by any corresponding majority in the country. In France, however, the habit of submission to the authorities is so well established that it seemed nothing more than natural that the new MINISTER of the INTERIOR should direct his subordinates how to turn this habit to account. What really puzzled Frenchmen was the omission of the late Government to take the same course. If M. THIERS had not left the electors free to choose their own representatives, it is by no means unlikely that the Conservatives would have condoned his other shortcomings; but they found it impossible to feel themselves safe under an Administration which neglected so indispensable a political duty. Consequently M. BEULÉ's first Circular was intended, not only as a manual for the new prefects, but also as an intimation to the friends of the Government that the officials in charge of the elections would no longer be allowed to disregard their duties as they had disregarded them under M. THIERS. If the Circular gave

some colour to the charge of Imperialism which has been freely brought against the new Cabinet, the Minister could at least plead that it was essential to let the Conservatives see that they had gained something by M. THIERS's deposition.

The second Circular probably means nothing more than the first, but it differs from it in the important particular of saying exactly what it means. That this distinction is not an insignificant one is clear from the impression which M. BEULÉ's language has made on the supporters of the Government. It is a well understood maxim in politics that there are many things that can be safely done which cannot be safely talked about. The French Conservatives are in the position of a candidate for a seat in Parliament who is not averse to judicious bribery, provided that his agent takes care that he knows nothing about it. It might have been whispered about that this or that Republican newspaper had been bought, and the Conservatives would only have felt a secret pleasure in the reflection that their interests were in careful hands. But to have the order to buy produced in its naked simplicity is another matter. M. BEULÉ's Circular is a virtual proclamation that Conservative principles are of so little account in the country that they can only be saved from extinction by hiring journalists to write them up; and though the Right may feel an uneasy suspicion that this is the fact, they are naturally disgusted at having their suspicions put into a shape in which they can be read to the whole Assembly. Men do not always like having their fears revealed to themselves, and in this case they have to endure the greater misfortune of having their fears revealed to their enemies. The bargain which M. BEULÉ is so anxious to conclude is now discredited beforehand. The newspapers which are "susceptible of becoming Conservative" will now have to put a bridle on their desires. Their conversion must be delayed until there has been time for the character of the arrangements in consideration of which their eyes are to be opened to the truth to drop out of recollection. However highly they may value the flow of telegraphic news which the Minister promises to the journals which support his policy, they must necessarily be shy of profiting by it. The Opposition journals will take care that the terms on which it is to be obtained are sufficiently paraded before the public, and a newspaper which is known to have been bribed is hardly worth the cost of bribing. Altogether, M. BEULÉ will perhaps think it best to postpone the organization of his new department. The publication of this unfortunate Circular is probably due to M. BEULÉ's injudicious haste to make use of his new machinery. He has been dismissing and appointing prefects at such a pace that he can hardly have known whom to trust and whom to distrust. If he had waited till the reconstruction of the staff was complete, the chances of disclosure would have been fewer. He would have had time to go carefully over the list of nominations, and any prefect betraying the nature of his instructions to M. GAMBETTA would have imperilled his whole future career. As it is, it is more than possible that the Circular has fallen into the hands of some official who had already been dismissed and was only holding office until his successor came to relieve him, or who knew that his stay in office would be at an end as soon as M. BEULÉ had acquainted himself with his antecedents. To communicate its contents to the leader of the Left was not only, therefore, an act of pleasant revenge on the Government, it was also the establishment of a certain claim on the Opposition whenever they are next in power. It is difficult to say how much injury to the Ministry this discovery may not do. It has already cost them the services of a useful subordinate, and it may yet lead to the retirement of M. BEULÉ himself. We can hardly believe that the Duke of BROGLIE has so entirely forgotten his Liberal training as to approve of this wholesale purchase of the provincial press. He is too much a victim to a blind fear of revolution to be very careful as to the means employed to stave it off; but he is probably as unwilling as his supporters to have the nature of these means too coarsely brought home to him. His relations with the colleague whose carelessness has caused this annoyance can scarcely be as pleasant as they were before, and if the change should induce M. BEULÉ to resign his office, the effect on a coalition built up of such incongruous materials may be unexpectedly disastrous. At all events, the debate of Tuesday proved that the Opposition could command, at first starting, and at the call of their least trusted chief, a compact minority of 308 votes.

The impression conveyed by this remarkable document is as little favourable to the wisdom as to the honesty of the Ministry. In so far as M. BEULÉ represents their views—and

if he is allowed to remain in office after taking upon himself the full responsibility of the Circular, he must be supposed to represent them completely—it is clear that they have not profited in the slightest degree by the experience of their predecessors. One principal source of the weakness from time to time disclosed in the seemingly strongest Governments in France has been the absence of any independent public opinion in their favour. They have had servants of all kinds ready to do their bidding so long as they were paid for it, but they have had no real friends. And one main cause of this friendlessness has been their anxiety to buy support instead of waiting for support to offer itself. The aid of a single newspaper voluntarily given on public grounds is more useful than the advocacy of a dozen when it has been secured at a figure perfectly well known to all who care to find it out. But if every paper is sounded by the prefect in order to ascertain whether it is willing to be bought, such independent journalism as exists in the French provinces naturally drifts towards the Opposition. It does not get any advantage from taking the part of the Government because it rejects the Government shilling, and yet every word it says in defence of the Government exposes it to the imputation of being in the Government pay. If it casts in its lot with the Opposition, it is no worse off in respect of special news, or whatever else be the coin in which the Government pays its lackeys, and it has at least the credit of being independent. The fallacy which runs through M. BEULÉ's second Circular is identical with that which was apparent in his first. He thinks that support is just as valuable when it merely expresses the self-interested calculations of those who render it as when it expresses their genuine wishes. A vote, in M. BEULÉ's estimation, is equally a vote whether it be given at the bidding of the Prefect or at the bidding of the voter's own convictions. A favourable article in a newspaper does the same good to the Government if it has been paid for in cash or in telegrams, as if it has been prompted by the unbiased wish of the conductors of the journal to see the Government strong and prosperous. Those who reason in this way forget that hired advocacy usually fails the Governments that trust to it at the very moment when they need it most. So long as the Government does well to itself, the newspapers in its pay will speak well of it; but as soon as it becomes uncertain how long a Government will retain the control of the cash-box, it is essential to its newspapers to shake themselves free of a connexion which threatens to become actively injurious to their prospects. The Duke of BROGLIE's Ministry has lost no time in making the accustomed blunder with more than the accustomed pomp and circumstance. Under the Empire a Circular to the same purpose might have been written any day, but it would never have been written in the same bald and undisguised language. The plagiarists of the Empire outdo, but do not improve upon, their model.

THE JUDICATURE BILL.

THE debate on the second reading of the Judicature Bill has happily cleared away nearly all the fogs and mists with which the controversy had been clouded. The suspicion which had been very needlessly entertained that the suggestions of the Equity Bar were prompted by covert hostility to the measure has been scattered to the winds. Every Equity lawyer who spoke in the House declared his cordial adhesion to the principle of the concurrent administration of the whole law of England in every branch of the judicature, and it is at last well understood that the LORD CHANCELLOR has found, as he ought to find, his warmest, though not his least critical, supporters in the ranks of his own Bar. The speech of the ATTORNEY-GENERAL in introducing the Bill, and his observations at the close of the debate, have supplied the most complete guarantee of the intention of the Government to introduce or accept such amendments as can be shown to be real improvements in the confessedly defective machinery of the Bill. And it is especially satisfactory to hear from the ATTORNEY-GENERAL that Mr. GLADSTONE and Mr. LOWE are satisfied that this is not a matter on which they should higggle about money, and that if the thing is worth doing, it is worth paying for to do it well. Of course this does not mean, and ought not to mean, reckless expenditure; but it must mean that the new Court is to be constituted with a view to the utmost possible efficiency, and not merely with the idea of getting the best tribunals that can be got at the price now paid.

After such assurances there was no room for opposition, and the Bill was read a second time with cordial unanimity.

The subordinate question whether the important amendments which are promised shall be settled in Select Committee or in Committee of the whole House turned merely on considerations of convenience. There is much work to be done, and we are not quite sure that it would not be done more rapidly over a Committee Room table than on the floor of the House. There is weight, however, in Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS'S observation, that it would be very difficult to get the lawyers together in the morning, and in the present temper of the House we may fairly count upon a full discussion of the clauses when the House gets into Committee. It is a great point gained to have nearly all questions of principle absolutely concluded. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL not only conceded, but welcomed with genuine enthusiasm, the proposal that the Common Law Divisions should be strengthened from the outset with an infusion of Equity trained colleagues, and he was able to convey the assurance, that this was desired by none more keenly than by the Common Law Judges themselves.

On the constitution of the Court of Appeal the assurances of the ATTORNEY-GENERAL were equally satisfactory. The permanent staff is to include three Equity Judges in addition to the Lords Justices. This will make a well-balanced Court, though it may be doubted whether they will find time to get through their work without splitting themselves into inconveniently small divisions. The question of the amount of strength which must be allotted to the Chancery Division to make it capable of dealing efficiently with the work assigned to it, has not yet been fully discussed; but no one impugned the broad principle insisted on by Mr. FOWLER that such strength should be given as to ensure the introduction of *viva voce* evidence, to save the jury box—from being once more consigned to the lumber-room, and to get rid of the scandal of delegating Judges' work to Chief Clerks in Equity and to Registrars in Bankruptcy. Amendments with these objects ought to be, and no doubt will be, jealously watched to guard against excess; but we may assume after what has passed that whatever is clearly shown to be essential to efficiency will be granted without demur.

One very important matter—that of procedure—will require a good deal of careful and rather minute attention. On this topic also the ATTORNEY-GENERAL has laid down a doctrine which every one, we think, will subscribe to. He referred, as the LORD CHANCELLOR had done before him, to the cause which more than anything else led to the failure of LORD HATHERLEY'S measures; and with the entire concurrence of the House, declared that in his judgment the lines on which the future procedure of the Court is to be built ought to be clearly laid down in the Bill itself, and that nothing should be delegated to any extra Parliamentary authority except the duty of filling up details in accordance with principles definitely indicated in the Bill and its schedule. At present it is admitted on all hands that the schedule does not perform the function which belongs to it. It leaves unsettled the very first principles and fundamental rules of pleading to be observed, and it would be quite possible without straining a word of it to fill it up in such a way as to reproduce the essence either of Chancery pleading or of Common Law pleading at the will of those to whom the duty of filling in the details might be committed. This would be in substance the same delegation of legislative power which was so much objected to in LORD HATHERLEY'S scheme; and however difficult it may be for the House of Commons to deal with such matters in Committee, the Bill will not be what its framers intend it to be unless the schedule is so far remodelled as to settle once for all the broad outline at least of the procedure to be substituted for the two antagonistic systems which are now in operation. In doing this it will not be necessary to descend into anything which can fairly be called detail, and the work will be substantially done when satisfactory and decisive answers are given to the following questions:—

1. Is a plaintiff to have the option either of commencing proceedings by a writ, to be followed after the defendant's appearance by a printed statement, or, if he prefers it, of serving both statement and writ in the first instance, and moving, it may be, for an injunction without an hour's delay? We can see no reason why it should not be open to a plaintiff to choose the one or the other method according to the nature of the case which he brings before the Court. But whichever way it is determined, the point ought to be settled by the schedule.

2. Are pleadings to be "open pleadings," that is, plain statements of fact, or are they to be "issuable pleadings" in the technical sense that they are to be framed so as necessarily to lead to definite specific issues, and to be subject to the old rules of special pleading by which this end is secured?

This is a question of primary importance, and for many reasons we are satisfied that the Judicature Commission was right in deciding in favour of open pleading. The great value of it is that it ensures all the facts being before the Court, and almost excludes the possibility of a suitor's cause being lost by a slip on the part of his pleader. The objections urged against it are that it leads sometimes to prolixity, and that it does not produce ready-made issues for a jury to decide upon. The first of these defects may be readily cured by punishing undue prolixity with costs, and the other by adopting the practice which has answered so well in the Divorce Court, of always trying causes on specific issues prepared by the parties and settled in case of difference by the Court. On the other hand, the merit of "issuable pleading" is that it is thoroughly scientific, or rather was so before the Common Law Procedure Acts tampered with it, and that it does in theory at any rate necessarily lead to definite issues. Unfortunately, these issues are too often general issues, under which juries decide upon mixed facts and law, and the scientific precision of the method is only attained by the suppression of the real facts until the hour of trial, and by the consequent risk of failure either from surprise or from a pleader's want of skill. One more consideration which seems to us conclusive in favour of open pleadings followed by issues settled by the Court is that verdicts would then always resemble special verdicts, and we should escape the scandal of new trials for misdirection. It is very monstrous that when a Judge lays down the law wrongly at *Nisi Prius* there should in many cases be no way of correcting the error except by directing a new trial of facts which have been well and fairly tried before. So long as juries are allowed to find verdicts on general issues involving mixed fact and law, this scandal cannot be cured. With settled issues and special verdicts, the Judge and the jury severally perform their functions, and the error of each may be separately corrected.

3. Are defendants to be at liberty to impose on a plaintiff the costly obligation of proving facts which cannot honestly be disputed? This is done now habitually at Common Law by pleading a traverse of every material allegation. It could not be done if pleadings were verified by oath as Answers are in Chancery, and as all affirmative pleadings are in the Divorce Court. It seems to us that an affidavit verifying all pleadings would save much oppression and expense, and greatly simplify procedure by excluding false issues.

4. Are interrogatories to be used really for discovery, as they are in Chancery, or only for verification, as they are at Common Law? At present the jurisdiction is absolutely the same in all our Courts, but the practice has been so moulded that a party to an action seldom gets any substantial discovery, though he does often assist his case after issue joined, by forcing admissions from his adversary. In administering relief against fraud, and in other branches of Equity, the Court would be paralysed if the use of interrogatories were restricted, as it practically is at Law, and as the schedule seems designed to restrict it. And one other little amendment on the Chancery practice as to discovery would be of incalculable value. At present a plaintiff or defendant may be compelled to produce on oath all material documents; but his oath is by affidavit on which there is no cross-examination. The amount of falsehood, sometimes wilful, and more often careless, to which this immunity leads is quite frightful. Of all affidavits in the world, affidavits verifying schedules of documents most require the safeguard of cross-examination, and this ought to be provided for by the schedule.

We have indicated these as among the most important points to which the labours of the Committee will have to be directed—not at all as exhausting the subjects on which amendments may be called for. The whole subject of references, to which Mr. HENRY MATTHEWS specially directed attention, will need much care to prevent it from degenerating into a wholesale delegation of Judges' work to inferior hands such as we have witnessed in the Court of Bankruptcy. The provisions for local registries are also open to the objection that they will often only substitute provincial for metropolitan agencies, that they will localize just those steps—the filing of documents and the like—in which distance does not add to cost, and that they will sever the subordinate officers of the Court from the Judges, who ought always to be accessible to them. We have not, however, dwelt upon these matters, because there seems less fear of their being overlooked than there is of the schedule of procedure being turned out in an unworkable shape.

LORD RUSSELL ON THE GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND.

LORD RUSSELL'S Bill for the regeneration of Ireland is a little disappointing. Two years ago he propounded a remarkable scheme for the establishment of a Heptarchy, of which four component States were to correspond with the existing Irish Provinces. The plan was to be more fully explained in an intended pamphlet which Lord RUSSELL, on mature consideration, has either not written or not published. When he gave notice of a Bill for the improvement of the government of Ireland, it was naturally supposed that it would provide for the establishment of four little Parliaments which would administer a modified Home Rule under Imperial control. It was much better that a hasty project should be deliberately abandoned. Lord RUSSELL is not on a level with irresponsible politicians whose principal function is to raise an occasional laugh at their own expense. A nation which respects itself includes in its susceptibility to ridicule statesmen whom it has entrusted with power through a long series of years. The present Bill provokes a smile only as an anti-climax. Lord RUSSELL cannot be accused of exaggerating the difficulty of governing Ireland; but it is strange that he should anticipate any material improvement from the abolition of the office of Lord-Lieutenant. A Secretary of State for Ireland could scarcely exercise any functions which are not at present discharged by the Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant; and if it is intended that he should reside permanently in Ireland, he would only be a less ornamental Viceroy.

The opinion that periodical riots are discreditable to Belfast cannot be condemned as a paradox, but it is difficult to understand how the disturbances can be attributed to the viceregal form of government. As Lord KIMBERLEY remarked, local authorities, unless they are altogether superseded, will be sometimes supine or otherwise inefficient. As soon as it was found that the aid of the central authority was required at Belfast, no time was lost in providing a sufficient force for the suppression of the riots. The O'KEEFE embarrassment seems to be still more remotely connected with the administration of Ireland through a Lord-Lieutenant. It has been thought fit to entrust the control of the system of education, as far as it is supported by public funds, to a separate body of Commissioners. A Committee of the House of Commons is now engaged in an inquiry into their conduct; and in the meantime popular opinion inclines to censure their supposed deference to the Roman Catholic hierarchy. If it were thought proper that the superintendence of schools should be transferred to a Cabinet Minister, Lord HARTINGTON might have the satisfaction of defending himself instead of apologizing for the Commissioners. The prevalence of agrarian crime is not the fault of the Lord-Lieutenant, and Parliament might, if it thought fit, dispense with the unanimity of Irish juries. Lord RUSSELL oddly limits his proposal that the verdict of two-thirds of the jury should be valid, by excepting from the operation of the new enactment all capital crimes. It is in cases of murder that juries are most dishonest and most obstinate, and hired assassins are not entitled to any exceptional chance of escape.

With a creditable and characteristic respect for precedent, Lord RUSSELL cites three high authorities in favour of his proposals, or in support of his arguments. Lord SOMERS held that the powers of the Scotch Privy Council ought not to be continued after the Union. Mr. BURKE concurred in other doctrines bearing on the enactments of the Bill; and, above all, Lord RUSSELL himself proposed the abolition of the Lord-Lieutenancy four-and-twenty years ago. The Privy Council to which Lord SOMERS objected was composed of Scotchmen, who would probably, if they had retained independent power, have thwarted the Imperial Government. Lord RUSSELL's former proposal had, it appears, been supported by all the principal leaders of both parties, with the exception of Mr. DISRAELI; but the clamour with which the scheme was received in Ireland induced the Government to abandon the project. It would be highly imprudent to afford at present any new pretext for Irish agitation. If Dublin Castle were suppressed, it would be asserted that English jealousy had abolished the last remnant and shadow of Irish independence. There is no reason to suppose that the institution has at any time been unpopular with the community whom alone it concerns. The mock splendour of a delegated royalty may excite the contempt of the happier frequenters of genuine levées and drawing-rooms; but if the Irish gentry or citizens take pleasure in attending the receptions of the Lord-Lieutenant, there is no reason for grudging them a harmless amusement. In more practical matters a certain advantage

attaches to the presence in Dublin of a local executive authority who is not visibly the mere delegate of the Imperial Government. When it becomes necessary to proclaim districts, or otherwise to use the powers of coercive Acts, the Lord-Lieutenant incurs less odium than a Secretary of State by issuing the proper orders. There is no question of a double or divided government, for the Lord-Lieutenant never affects in the smallest matter an independent position. Since the days of Lord ANGLESEY, who was summarily recalled because, as the Duke of WELLINGTON said, he appeared to have been bitten by a mad Papist, no English Minister has been encumbered with a contumacious representative in Ireland. It may be doubted whether Lord RUSSELL himself relies seriously on the efficacy of his proposed remedy for Irish evils. A great part of his speech would have been equally applicable to any other plan for the discouragement of Irish disorder. It is true that the arrogant and intolerant minority of Lord RUSSELL's younger years now requires protection against the more intolerant and more arrogant majority; but it is impossible to redistribute political power which is unfortunately in a great part of Ireland divided between agitators and priests. The demagogues have of late been unusually passive, and there is no advantage in providing them with a fresh cause for clamour and disturbance. It would be far better to abolish an initiative and formal substitute for royalty than to establish legislative Assemblies in the four Provinces; but the two successive schemes proceed on diametrically opposite principles. It cannot be right both to decentralize the Executive Government and to convert it into a kind of Federation. Lord RUSSELL's temper inclines him to the conclusion that he is capable of providing a remedy for any political evil which he may discern; but Irish perversity and disaffection would survive any administrative changes.

Lord KIMBERLEY answered Lord RUSSELL in the conventional language which was best suited to the occasion; and Lord GRANVILLE vied with his colleague in professions of respect for the promoter of the Bill, and of inability to form a hasty judgment on so important a proposal. There is no reason to fear that the Bill will be seriously prosecuted, for the late period of the Session would alone provide a sufficient excuse for abstaining from immediate legislation. Lord MONCK would have acted more prudently if he had refrained from any defence of the conduct of the Education Commissioners. His explanation of the reasons for dismissing Mr. O'KEEFE from the management of the Callan school is both surprising and unsatisfactory. It had been supposed that the priest of every parish was either really or professedly an official manager, and that the apology for the Commissioners was their belief that after his suspension Mr. O'KEEFE no longer possessed the necessary qualification. It is an error to suppose that the State compromises its own dignity or supremacy by recognizing certificates which are conferred by independent bodies. It is sometimes provided in Acts of Parliament that certain functionaries shall be nominated by the Royal Society, or perhaps by the President of the Institute of Civil Engineers. If the President were to be removed on a charge of having violated some rule of the Society, the Government would probably recognize his successor without inquiring into the reasons of his deposition. The Irish Education Commissioners had at least a plausible case when they declined to decide on the validity of Cardinal CULLEN's Legatine authority. A *prima facie* proof of suspension or removal might raise in their minds reasonable doubts of Mr. O'KEEFE's title to his office. Lord MONCK now explains that the Commissioners in the exercise of their discretion removed Mr. O'KEEFE from the management, not because he had been suspended from his cure, but on the ground that his moral influence had been impaired by the suspension. It is a comparatively simple proposition that the Roman Catholic hierarchy are the proper interpreters of their own regulations; and it might be forcibly contended that every parish priest had covenanted to abide by the laws of his Church. If Lord MONCK's statement is accurate, the Commissioners decided that Mr. O'KEEFE's character had been injuriously affected; while at the same time they declined to inquire into the justice of the sentence which conveyed the stigma. As Lord CAIRNS suggested, it would, on Lord MONCK's showing, have been but equitable to allow Mr. O'KEEFE to state his case before he was punished for a supposed loss of moral influence. It might be unnecessary to hear evidence on the undisputed fact of the suspension; but the Commissioners exercised a judgment of their own when they took into consideration the moral consequences of the sentence. Even if there has been in this case a miscarriage of justice, some part of the administration of Ireland must be exercised

by local functionaries, whether they are called Commissioners of Education or Lord-Lieutenants. There is little advantage in proving that the present government of Ireland is not ideally perfect.

MR. HARCOURT'S MOTION.

THE discussion of the Masters and Servants Act, and of the law of conspiracy, on Mr. VERNON HARCOURT's motion was singularly indefinite. It must be confessed that it is not easy to avoid confusion in treating of the necessarily vague law of conspiracy. As Mr. HARCOURT said, it is anomalous that several circumstances, each in itself lawful, should collectively constitute an unlawful act; but in this case the proceeding which is described as lawful means something which is supposed to be morally wrong, although it only becomes technically criminal when it has been concerted among several persons. Neither Mr. HARCOURT nor any other critic of the actual law had proposed to undertake any new legislation on the subject up to the time of the debate; but Mr. HARCOURT has since, on the invitation of Mr. GLADSTONE, introduced a Bill to amend the Law of Conspiracy as applied to Masters and Servants. In the meantime a heavy responsibility is thrown on the Courts which administer the law; and it is unfortunate that in one well known case an able and upright judge should have fallen into the error of passing an excessively severe sentence. Justice BRETT apparently considered that the conspiracy of which the gas-stokers had been convicted was extraordinarily culpable; but it was only by a far-fetched process of reasoning that the inconvenience which might have resulted from their combination could be regarded as the measure of their guilt. The workmen employed by the Gas Companies had contracted, not to light the streets of London, but to perform a certain kind and amount of labour, under the usual conditions of similar contracts. They were entitled to think that in refusing to continue their service they incurred at the utmost the statutable penalties for breach of service, and consultation or consent amongst themselves was necessarily incidental to the offence. The severity of the sentence can only be explained on the assumption that the workmen had themselves calculated on the extent of mischief which they were likely to cause as an instrument for the coercion of their employers; nor can it be doubted that the agitators who organized the strike trusted to their hold on the fears of the Gas Companies and of the community at large. It would nevertheless have been better to treat the refusal of the men to work as an ordinary case of breach of contract. Down to the date of the sentence the general feeling of indignation had rendered even the Unionist leaders unwilling to justify the outrageous conduct which had been instigated by some of their agents. From the time when the gas-stokers were condemned to imprisonment for a year the agitators have profited by a reaction in favour of the men.

Mr. HARCOURT would have been justified in defending judges and magistrates at the expense of the Legislature if the amount of punishment were not necessarily left in some degree to the discretion of the proper tribunals. It is impossible to define beforehand the moral culpability of any but the most distinct and simple crimes. A man who wilfully kills another without sufficient legal excuse incurs capital punishment. Some murders are undoubtedly more atrocious than others; but every murderer is supposed to deserve the highest penalty known to the law; and no severer sentence can be passed on the worst of criminals. No legislative wisdom can determine the guilt of an assault or of a threat; and even manslaughter may be justly punished with a day's imprisonment or with penal servitude for life. The judge is necessarily responsible for the apportionment of punishment to guilt; nor can he answer, as Mr. HARCOURT suggests, to the question why he passed too severe a sentence, that Parliament bade him do it. The law of conspiracy cannot be accurately said to be tolerable only because it is not executed. If Justice BRETT's direction to the jury was sound in law, it was still open to him to have sentenced the defendants to imprisonment for a month or six weeks, and not for a year. "The system of piling up misdemeanour on misdemeanour, and crime upon crime," is unavoidable, if regulations necessary to the comfort and good order of society are to be enacted and enforced. Mr. HARCOURT, who is never tired of denouncing the penal legislation of the Parks, was shocked because the police summoned persons for skipping with a rope, for fishing for minnows in the Serpentine, or for using soap in bathing. To less zealous sticklers for constitutional liberty it seems not unreasonable that a piece of water in a

public Park should be protected against pollution, or against any mode of user which interferes with the general enjoyment. Grown-up men and women who skip in public are scarcely entitled to the sympathy of the respectable part of the community. It is perfectly easy to comply with reasonable by-laws, which can only be enforced against perverse minorities by moderate fines with the alternative of imprisonment. Skipping in the Park is *malum in se*, and the use of soap is *malum prohibitum*.

The unlucky sentence on the feminine rioters of Chipping Norton was not justly described by Mr. HARCOURT as a natural consequence of rash and inconsiderate legislation. In any country where laws for the protection of person and property exist, threats of violence and menacing demonstrations interfering with freedom of action must be regarded as criminal, and seven days' imprisonment would be an unduly lenient minimum of punishment. In the particular case it would have been just and prudent to treat female rioters with an indulgence which can scarcely be provided by law; but there are occasions on which infuriated women are more savage than the worst of men. The *THEROIGNES* of the first French Revolution were, if possible, more bloodthirsty and brutal than the male assassins with whose aid they regenerated society. The labourers' wives at Chipping Norton have happily not reached the same level of degradation, and they may even be excused for the probably apocryphal accounts of their sufferings which they have since furnished to sympathetic reporters. A hardworking village scold has seldom an opportunity of becoming a martyr and heroine. It was an odd circumstance that the debate should have mainly turned on a state of the law which has been unaffected by recent enactments. Lord ELCHO clearly showed that the Masters and Servants Act had greatly mitigated the severity of the law, and neither the Chipping Norton termagants nor the gas-stokers were convicted under the provisions of the Act. Mr. BRUCE answered the demands of the late Hyde Park meeting rather than the resolutions proposed by Mr. HARCOURT, when he announced that the Government was not at present prepared to alter the Masters and Servants Act. The relief which the new law affords to the working class is strikingly illustrated by the returns of convictions. Mr. BRUCE showed that in the year before the Act was passed, 7,557 persons were convicted of breach of contract of service, and that in 1872 the entire number of convictions was 742. It may be questioned whether unlimited license in the violation of contracts is beneficial to the workmen themselves. If debts were not recoverable at law, pecuniary accommodation would be generally withheld; and impediments to the conduct of business, caused by distrust of the fidelity of workmen, would not tend to raise wages or to increase the demand for labour. The policy and the justice of applying a severe scale of punishment when several workmen break their engagements in concert is more than questionable. In almost every case of desertion from service which occurs, the offence might be brought within the elastic definition of conspiracy. The Unionists are anxious, however, not only to be enabled to commit breaches of contract with impunity, but to be relieved from the penalties at present attached to the intimidation of their fellow-workmen. The nature of this demand is practically illustrated by a case which has just been tried by Baron PIGOTT, and in which three carpenters were sentenced to imprisonment, one for nine and the other two for six months, for combining to plague and worry a non-Unionist workman. The poor fellow was hooted at, pelted with pieces of wood, knocked down, knelt upon so as to be nearly suffocated, and beaten. His life was made intolerable, and he had to quit his employment. Baron PIGOTT very justly observed that, if there were no law to punish such outrages, the weak part of society would be exposed to the worst kinds of tyranny and oppression.

Some incidental suggestions made in the course of the debate were not unworthy of attention. Dr. BALL objected both to appeals from Courts of Law to Parliament, and to the supervision claimed by the Law Officers over the decisions of Judges. The practice had, according to Dr. BALL, first commenced in Ireland; and he added that vicious principles applied in Ireland invariably came home to England to roost. The SOLICITOR-GENERAL, in answer to the challenge, claimed a right of censuring the Courts, and with better reason he protested against the habit of paying personal compliments to judges. Mr. CHARLES BULLER used to say that, if he wished for an unqualified eulogy on his character, he would induce some member of the House of Commons to make a formal attack on his conduct, in the confidence that all his friends would immediately vie with each other in complimentary exaggerations.

tion. In the opinion of the SOLICITOR-GENERAL, blame is the correlative to praise; and it would undoubtedly be inconvenient to engage in a Parliamentary discussion of the demerits of high legal functionaries. When the SOLICITOR-GENERAL becomes Master of the Rolls, it will be proper to remember his repugnance to any Parliamentary recognition of his judicial qualifications. The authority of criticisms passed by the Law Officers on judicial sentences will depend mainly on the personal qualifications of the respective parties. Justice BRETT once held the same office which is now adorned by Sir G. JESSEL; and any legal competence which he may formerly have possessed can scarcely have been deteriorated by judicial experience. Mr. HENRY JAMES justly condemned any expression of sentiment which might possibly be influenced by considerations relating to the future elections. From this time to the end of the present Parliament, measures and speeches will be more or less coloured by personal hopes and fears. Recent experience seems to show that members either believe their constituencies to be comparatively rational, or at least have convinced themselves that crotchets are chiefly held by insignificant knots of agitators. It would be especially undesirable that laws affecting capital and labour should be discussed with a view to popular favour. It was perhaps well to give the House of Commons an opportunity of intimating disapproval of an excessive sentence. No light was thrown on the state of the law or on the expediency of altering it, although both the Law Officers declared their disapproval of the charge of Justice BRETT, and their preference for a more recent exposition of the law by Justice LUSH. Mr. BRUCE's statement was the most satisfactory feature of the debate.

CANADIAN PROGRESS.

NOW that Prince Edward Island has resolved to throw in its lot with the Canadian Dominion, Newfoundland is the only British colony in North America which holds aloof from the Union; and the adhesion of Newfoundland may be regarded as only a question of time. It is true that Newfoundland has from the first been perfectly consistent in its sullen indifference and contempt for the whole scheme, and there is no immediate prospect of any change in this attitude. But consistency may be too dearly paid for, and Newfoundland will probably come to the conclusion that it is hardly worth while to go on sulking outside the Union now that all its neighbours have gone in. Besides, there is a sort of magnetic attraction in the larger body which has become more powerful as the process of agglomeration has gone on, and which it will be difficult for a single isolated particle to resist. Ever since the plan of confederation was first taken up in earnest, the malcontents have been gradually coming round. Some held off from pride, some from prejudice, and some perhaps because they thought their coyness would command its price. If this last consideration at all prevailed in the minds of the Prince Edward Island people, they are probably disposed to congratulate themselves on the success of their tactics. They have certainly got very good terms out of the Dominion, and much better than they would have been able to obtain a few years ago. They are to be entitled to run up liabilities at the rate of fifty dollars a head, and as they cannot be expected to do this all at once, they are to receive from the Government five per cent. on the difference between their actual and their authorized indebtedness. Among other advantages to be derived from the Union will also be the maintenance of an efficient steam service all the year round between the Island and the mainland of the Dominion at the expense of the "general Government." It cannot be said that the Dominion gains much by this transaction in the way of a substantial addition to its resources; but the new sea-board will be useful from a military as well as a commercial point of view, and of course it is well to carry out the policy of amalgamation thoroughly, and to bring every patch of British soil under the control of a single Government. Even if the process be a costly one, it will be more than repaid by the avoidance of future complications, as well as by the impulse which unity imparts to national vigour and productiveness. Now that Newfoundland alone is wanted to complete the Union, there will probably be a high bid for its adhesion. It is understood that the opposition to amalgamation is led by the Roman Catholic priesthood, but the religious difficulty ought not to be more formidable in Newfoundland than in Canada. Practical experience has disposed of most of the objections which were formerly urged to the centralization of affairs. No difficulty has been found in reconciling the superior authority of the general Go-

vernment with the fullest exercise of local rights and liberties in all strictly local matters. At first sight there may appear to be something awkwardly, and even dangerously, complicated in a system of administration under which a series of semi-independent States, each with a Government of its own, is governed by a general colonial Parliament and Cabinet, which in turn are under the control of the Imperial Parliament and Government of the mother-country. But it is a peculiarity of English institutions that, though they sometimes look clumsy in theory, they work capitally in practice; and, tested in this way, the administration of the Dominion has already yielded satisfactory results.

It is now some ten years since the great project of confederation was first taken up in earnest, and, though we may hope that its completion is not far off, it is still incomplete. To some this may seem rather slow work, but it is necessary to remember the magnitude of the operation, and the difficulties which attended it. What had to be done was really nothing less than to build up into a great nation a number of detached, independent, jealous, and even, in some respects, antagonistic communities. It was clear enough that the plan, if it could be carried out, would be for the good of the colonies at large; but it was also clear that it would not altogether tend to the advantage of various interests, both of a personal and commercial kind, which had their root in local narrowness and isolation. For these confederation meant simply competition in a wider field, and the prospects of competition were disquieting. The smaller States were alarmed lest they should be swallowed up by the bigger ones, and all sorts of local notables and monopolists trembled for their privileges. Differences of race, religion, and politics, provincial jealousies and commercial rivalries all had to be overcome in welding the various groups together into a compact and homogeneous system. In one notorious instance an eager advocate of a partial confederation in which he had some chance of taking the lead, opposed the larger scheme in which his province would have occupied a less prominent position, and subsequently recanted again in favour of the Union when the fact of its accomplishment was brought under his notice by the offer of a governorship. Very little reflection is required to understand that a process of this kind must necessarily be somewhat tedious. But if the work has been slow, it has at least been sure. No member of the Confederation can complain of having been coerced or cajoled into joining; each entered after full deliberation and of its own free will; and happily there are now no symptoms of lingering resentment or repentance to disturb the harmony of the family. As far as any questions have been raised as to the original terms of Union, the Dominion Government and Parliament have shown the utmost readiness to deal with them in a liberal spirit. The Act which has just been passed, transferring to the Dominion a larger share of the provincial debts than was at first agreed upon, will tend to consolidate the Union, while the credit of the general Government will enable it easily to sustain the additional burden laid upon it.

It is too soon to attempt to estimate the full consequences of the Confederation policy, but it is at least evident that it has already had an important influence, not only on the character of the British North American communities, but on their relations with the mother-country and with the great nation with whom they share the continent. Instead of a group of weak and scattered settlements, all pulling different ways, prone to provocation and impotent for defence, there is now a compact, solid, powerful confederacy, conscious alike of its strength and of its responsibilities. Whether British North America is destined to set up as an independent State, or to remain, as it appears sincerely anxious to do, in loyal brotherhood with England, there can be no doubt about the fact that it has become a nation in itself; and it is well that this should be borne in mind. Measured even by New World standards of greatness, it is a great nation with a vast territory and immense resources. Lower Canada, a country as large as France; Upper Canada, considerably larger than Great Britain and Ireland; Nova Scotia, larger than Greece; New Brunswick, equal to a pair of Denmark; British Columbia, as large as the Austrian Empire; and the North-West Territories, covering an area about half as large as the whole Continent of Europe—here are all the elements of a vigorous and mighty State. It is characteristic of the Dominion that it combines the steadiness of an old country with the freshness, elasticity, and golden opportunities of a new one. The climate, though severe in some regions, is, on the whole, equable; and the people display a sedate robustness which is in striking contrast to the feverish excitement of their

neighbours in the South. The statistics of the recent census show a remarkable development in almost every direction—in population, trade, fisheries, and agriculture. Yet the Dominion, strong and prosperous as it is, is only in its early manhood. It is now entering on a larger, fuller, and more ambitious life, with loftier aims and more serious responsibilities. It has a great work before it, but it will be arduous and trying work, which will test to the utmost the statesmanship of its Ministers, and the patriotism of the people, and which will certainly not be free from checks, disappointments, and delays. It is satisfactory to observe the spirit in which the Dominion appears to be settling to its task. The petty and rancorous attacks which have lately been made on the PRIME MINISTER have found no echo in the country, and all classes seem to be anxious to support the Government in carrying out the enterprises which are essential to the success of the Confederation. The prudent, moderate, and generous attitude of the Dominion during and after the *Alabama* negotiations supplies the strongest proof of its loyal attachment to the mother-country.

THE SHAH'S VISIT.

WE know pretty well what will be the general nature of the remarks suggested by the Shah's visit. A few men who happen really to know something about Eastern history and manners will rejoice for a brief period in the sudden accession of popular interest in their peculiar topics; and, if they are wise, they will make hay while the sun shines. Ministers will of necessity talk in the ordinary dialect of their class, and will assure our visitor, with more or less pompous circumlocution, that we are his only true and original friends. A hubbub of allusions to the *Arabian Nights* will prove once more the omniscience of writers in popular newspapers; and, after a short time, our interest will die away, and the birth of a new hippopotamus, or the breaking out of another revolution, will absorb our whole attention. These outbursts of excitement run their course as regularly as the symptoms of a common disease, and we know all about them beforehand. But it would be of some real interest if we could tell what impression they will make upon the mind of our distinguished visitor. If he could be induced to add one more name to the list of royal authors, and set down frankly and fairly just what he thinks about us, we might possibly gain a curious insight into our own as well as our neighbour's mind. We fear, indeed, that the chances are that even in that case, we should be disappointed. Probably the Shah, like everybody else under similar circumstances, would see through the spectacles provided for him, and his observations would be little more than a confused reflection of leading articles, complimentary despatches, and formal conversations with official magnates. His independent comments would, we may guess, be simply an expansion of the remark made by the sheikh in *Eothen*:—"What a wonderful people! whirr, whirr, all by wheels! whizz, whizz, all by steam!" Railways, armour-clad ships, and the ordinary list of mechanical wonders are enough to occupy even a royal mind in the brief intervals between State ceremonials. He will not be allowed time to ask seriously what it all means, till he returns to his domestic comforts; and probably he will then be content to abandon the insoluble problem, retaining only some vague impression of the wonderful bustle and confusion which are everlastingly proceeding, luckily for him, at a considerable distance from Persia. We ought, in fact, to have provided our visitor with a judicious guide. He should have been accompanied by one of those rare teachers who can pierce through the confused surface of things to the essential forces which are working below, and distinguish between the permanent and the accidental. Such a man might tell him what is the real value of this strange and noisy phenomenon which we call civilization and progress; whether, on the whole, we are a nobler set of human beings than his own subjects, with larger faculties, superior beliefs, and in a healthier social state; or whether, after all, progress means nothing but a series of changes of rather questionable value. It would indeed be difficult to determine upon the most suitable interpreter. If the distinguished stranger went to each of our recognized teachers in turn, he would be considerably bewildered by the end of the course. Which would be the true Daniel to expound his troubled dream? Should he listen to Mr. Carlyle, to Mr. Herbert Spencer, to Dr. Newman, to Mr. Frederic Harrison, to Dean Stanley, to Mr. Spurgeon, or to Mr. Bradlaugh? Each of those gentlemen would be happy to give him a clue to the strange labyrinth in which he will find himself; but it is to be feared that beyond a general impression that there is something or other not quite right in spite of telegraphs and steamboats, he would scarcely find any common element in their teaching. We certainly are not prepared at the present moment to say which out of a vast crowd of would-be prophets approximates most nearly to the truth. The solutions of the great problem offered for our acceptance are enough to reduce any ordinary intellect to hopeless perplexity, and we do not claim to be absolutely infallible. One reflection, indeed, which we may pretty safely attribute to an intelligent visitor from a different world is the commonplace about the love which

Christians bear to each other. A Darwinian might put it into scientific shape for him. The struggle for existence goes on, he might say, in one form or another all over the world. Whether we fight in gloves or with naked fists, it makes little difference. We may knock you on the head summarily, or may civilly squeeze you out of existence by a decent and well-equalized pressure; but the result is the same in either case. The strongest races will conquer the world, and the weakest will have to clear the course for them. Our proper type is the ironclad steamboat to which you have been introduced. It is not a more beautiful object than those which it has supplanted; on the contrary, it is perhaps the ugliest and most grotesque piece of work that ever succeeded in keeping itself afloat since the days of the Ark. Compared with an ancient galley, or even with one of those modern ships of the line which are still floating in our harbours, it seems to be the very incarnation of deformity. But it has the one surpassing merit that it could in five minutes reduce to helpless wreck all the other fleets that preceded it. A tough skin, and a power of hitting hard anybody who hits you, are the great qualifications for success in this world, whether for individuals or races. The type which you, our visitor, represent has a great many merits which have entirely disappeared from amongst us. You have a delicate artistic sense, which may be easily estimated by comparing a Persian carpet with the discordant colours of our British products. It is doomed to disappear before our coarser work, as certainly as wild flowers with all their beauty are suppressed by the advance of cabbages and potato fields. You still possess the secret of courteous and dignified manners. An army of British bagmen will shove you to the wall, and teach you to be as coarse and pretentious as themselves, without being one whit less vicious than you are at present. If you ask for the secret of our superiority, we shall reply, as we are bound to do, that we have the true religion and you have a false one. To be honest, however, we must add that we possess the further secret of never allowing our religion to interfere with business. We have no uncomfortable scruples about cheating you when it pays us to do so, for we have discovered that adulteration is a legitimate form of competition. If you complain of this logic, we can support our reasoning by cannon-balls in as great numbers as may be required. In one sense you owe something to the same principle which is the source of our power. Natural selection has adapted you to a climate where we cannot as yet thrive and multiply; and therefore there is no danger of our just now treating you to the same civilizing influence which has been applied to the inhabitants of the American continent. Perhaps we may some day take the trouble to govern you, if we can see our way to making a paying concern of the business; but meanwhile we shall be content to treat you civilly so long as we have our own way in everything. There is, indeed, a prospect of some further developments of policy. One of our great philosophers has recently propounded a plan for washing the black stain out of Africa by turning on a stream of Chinese immigrants. When once the system is perfected, it is obviously capable of a wide application. We shall of course occupy ourselves all that part of the planet which suits our taste, and we shall plant the remainder with the races most likely to be convenient to us. It is highly probable that in such a case some of the existing breeds will turn out to be altogether superfluous; we shall get rid of them as we should give up Southdown sheep or shorthorn cattle if a more profitable breed could be introduced, and you had better prepare yourselves for such a contingency by adapting yourselves as much as possible to our model.

Some such sermon as this would be given by many people as embodying the ultimate lesson from our experience, and that which all our parade of civility is really intended to impress upon our guests. The world is to the strongest; we are the strongest; therefore be on our side. That is the pithy syllogism expressed by reviews, and displays of ironclads, and inspections of manufactories. And it is easy to draw a pathetic picture of the representative of an old-fashioned type of civilization, half-awakened from the dreamy East, and looking upon the modern world in something of the temper of Heine's gods in exile. He sees that the struggle is somehow going against him, but does not admit that he is being supplanted by his betters. There are plenty of quack doctors who will show him how to avoid his fate. With a few missionaries, a constitutional Government, compulsory education, and the introduction of the Prussian military system, he may become as good as his neighbours; for, with those remedies, all evils may be eradicated from the world. He feels, however, instinctively that it is not a mere question of mechanism, and that a European dress, however beautiful and convenient it may be in itself, does not change a Persian into an Englishman. He wraps himself in his fatalism, and resigns himself with as much dignity as he can muster to the inscrutable decrees of Providence. Sentimentalists have reproduced the same type in a great variety of forms. The noble savage watching the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers, the Mexican confronted by the Spaniard, or the dignified Eastern staring in dumb amazement at the irrepressible European, have been described with a lavish expenditure of rhetoric. In each case we are supposed to see simplicity, nature, and good faith opposed to a form of civilization not intrinsically superior, but more thoroughly skilled in plausibly disguising Hobbes's cardinal virtues—force and fraud. The only comfort suggested is that their fate may be avenged at some distant period. When our civilization crumbles under its deeply seated corruption, some new barbarians may break up the

old order; and possibly some race which we now despise is already beginning to look upon us as the ancient Teutons once looked upon the wonders of the Roman Empire. And yet, easy as it is to indulge in the pathetic vein, and to win cheap credit for virtue by denouncing the wickedness of the contemporary world, we suspect that this is to beg the question in one sense as presumptuously as the vulgar panegyrist of progress beg it in the other. There is a certain fallacy in the mode of stating the argument. The statement that the strongest races survive is treated as identical with the statement that their survival is owing simply to brute force. All fine phrases about civilization, humanity, and brotherly love are therefore assumed to be a mere superficial varnish, covering as much brutality as has existed at any previous period. But it is plain enough that force thus used covers a great many qualities of undeniable excellence. The European races are the strongest, because they are the best disciplined and most intelligent, races in the world; and it is absurd to pretend to regret that they should occupy the world, even to the complete exclusion of some inferior populations. Nobody can be really sorry that great territories in America or Australia should support millions of decently comfortable white men instead of a few wandering tribes of naked savages, or even noble Indians of the pattern of Captain Jack and his Modocs. Nor is it of necessity lamentable that Englishmen should govern the weaker Eastern races. If our rule is founded simply on our strength, that is, so far as it goes, a very good foundation. "We are stronger than you, and therefore we will govern you," sounds brutal, because it is a formula generally employed to justify government for purely selfish purposes. But, if we add that we are stronger because we are wiser, and with a superior political and social organization, we make a statement which may be false or hypocritical, but which, if true, gives a real justification. It is desirable that the most highly developed races should govern, and strength is in a rough way the best available test of other virtues.

The real question comes at a further step in the argument, and is obviously far too complicated to admit of any simple answer. That Englishmen should be substituted for naked savages is almost a clear gain; but the means by which a desirable end is obtained may or may not involve wanton cruelty and a wasteful destruction of human beings for whom a useful though a subordinate position might possibly have been found. And in like manner, in our dealings with Eastern races, we are not to be condemned or approved simply because we choose to have our own way, but because it is a bad or a good way. The satire is generally directed against the wrong point, for the obvious reason that such satire demands no knowledge of the facts. Whether, on the whole, English influence in the East has been beneficial or injurious, whether we have destroyed more than we have replaced, or have wantonly crushed good things which might have been preserved by more tenderness, is a question on which only a very few people are qualified to express an opinion. But it is easy to denounce us as tyrannical for venturing to govern at all; which amounts to saying that we must be either tyrants or cowards. Such a mode of reading our obligations naturally implies that we are wolves in sheep's clothing; but it begins by assuming that all real government is wolfish. And yet, whatever may be said in our defence, it must be admitted that there remains much that is really sad in the process we are contemplating. Progress, whatever its value, implies loss as well as gain. Even the savage has some qualities which we cannot fully replace; and every imperfect race that goes under in the struggle for existence carries with it some charms which are henceforward mere matter of tradition. No method has yet been devised for saving all that is valuable from the wreck of ancient civilizations; and the efforts which we make so frequently in the present time to revive extinct forms of beauty in art or literature generally serve only to remind us how hopelessly dead they have become.

THE DANGERS OF THE MONEY MARKET.

ANYBODY who wishes to have a clear idea of the workings of what is called the Money Market should procure a little volume which Mr. Bagehot has just published under the title of *Lombard Street* (H. S. King & Co.), and he will there find the whole thing in a nut-shell. Mr. Bagehot contends that the Money Market is as real and concrete as anything else, and can be described in as plain words, and he has certainly given a very graphic and interesting account of it. The subject is one, it is almost needless to say, on which Mr. Bagehot writes with the authority of a man who combines practical experience with scientific study. Without attempting to follow him in his description of the various processes and agencies which go to make up the Money Market, we propose merely to bring into notice some of the dangers of the present system which have struck us very forcibly in reading his book. Within a comparatively brief period a great development, we might almost say a revolution, has taken place in the banking system of the country. In the first place, the old-fashioned private banks would seem to be gradually disappearing. In 1810 there were forty private banks in Lombard Street admitted to the Clearing-house; there are now only thirteen, although in the interval the business of banking has enormously increased. As the old banks die out, no new ones take their place. It is recognized as hopeless to try to set up a new private bank. The successful management of a bank requires qualities for the continued transmission of which from one generation to another there

is no security; and a private banker who does not manage his own bank stands in a dangerous position. Moreover, the competition of the joint-stock banks is difficult to be withstood. It is perhaps idle to lament what cannot be helped; yet it is impossible to deny that the system of private banks furnished a certain guarantee of personal character which is almost necessarily wanting in all kinds of joint-stock companies. The directorial management of the latter is undoubtedly their weak point. A daring and unscrupulous general manager can do almost what he likes if the directors let him, and there is no security that the directors are capable either of seeing through his game or holding him in. Even if the directors are really honest and competent men, their supervision of the affairs of the company must, to a great extent, be extremely superficial. Apart, however, from the personal administration of banks, there is a serious danger in the system on which they are now conducted—we mean the system of cutting down reserves to the lowest point compatible with current payments over the counter, and trusting to the Bank of England to support them on an emergency. Mr. Weguelin, who was Governor of the Bank of England during the panic of 1857, brought this feature of modern banking under the notice of Sir G. C. Lewis; and Mr. Bagehot also gives an emphatic warning on the subject. "If," said Mr. Weguelin, "the amount of the reserve kept by the Bank of England be contrasted with the reserve kept by the joint-stock banks, a new and hitherto little considered source of danger to the credit of the country will present itself. The joint-stock banks of London, judging by their published accounts, have deposits to the amount of 30,000,000*l.* Their capital is not more than 3,000,000*l.*, and they have on an average 31,000,000*l.* invested in one way or another, leaving only 2,000,000*l.* as a reserve against all this mass of liabilities." In order to bring out the full extent of the evil, Mr. Weguelin should have added that, while bankers generally trusted to the Bank of England, the Bank deemed itself to be at liberty to dispose of the reserves deposited with it as it chose. Since 1857 this state of things has certainly not improved.

Mr. Bagehot describes Lombard Street as by far the greatest combination of economical power and economical delicacy which the world has ever seen; and he quotes a few figures which certainly give one a vivid and even startling impression of the largeness of the London loan-fund. The known deposits—that is, the deposits of banks which publish accounts—may be set down thus:—

London (December 31, 1872)	£120,000,000
Paris (February 27, 1873)	13,000,000
New York (February, 1873)	40,000,000
German Empire (January 31, 1873)	8,000,000

But the unknown deposits—the deposits concerning which no accounts are published—are also much greater in London than anywhere else. There is, in fact, more ready money available for employment in London at this moment than was ever before collected in the world. It is true, of course, as Mr. Bagehot remarks, that the deposits of bankers are not a strictly accurate measure of the resources of a Money Market. It is a matter of choice with people who have money where they will keep it, and in France and Germany, and other non-banking countries, there are vast sums which are privately hoarded up and not put in banks. But we are now speaking only of cash ready for investment, what Mr. Bagehot aptly calls "money-market money." The money which is not kept in banks is scattered about in small quantities in the hands of an infinite number of people. It is difficult to get at it at all, and it cannot be got at easily and quickly. But the English money is borrowable money, and may be had on the instant. It is only within a comparatively short time that the financial resources of London have reached this point, and they are still growing. In 1844 the liabilities of the four great London joint-stock banks were 10,637,000*l.*; they are now more than 60,000,000*l.* The private deposits of the Bank of England have increased in the same period from 9,000,000*l.* to 18,000,000*l.* The explanation of this remarkable growth is not far to seek. In the first place, domestic banking has developed greatly. Almost everybody who has an income of a few hundreds a year keeps a banking account nowadays. Every little shopkeeper has his banker. In the next place, the relation between the country banks and the London banks is closer and more intimate than it used to be. The country bankers are constantly receiving large sums, but they keep as little as possible in their own cellars. The bulk of it is sent up to London, and there is consequently a steady flow of country money into the metropolis. The effect of the Franco-German war has also been to pour money into London. Paris has now lost most of its financial importance; the Reds have frightened away the capitalists, and London has now become the great bank and settling-house of Europe. All exchange operations are centring more and more here; and though this pre-eminence has been partly gained through an external accident, it is founded on natural conditions, and will probably be maintained. The number of mercantile bills drawn upon London incalculably surpasses, as Mr. Bagehot remarks, those drawn on any other European city. "London is the place which receives more than any other place, and pays more than any other place," and therefore it is the natural clearing-house. It is probable, therefore, that the store of ready money in London will go on increasing rather than diminishing. The English have a far larger fund of this "money-market money," or loanable cash seeking investment than any other nation, and other nations find it convenient to send their reserves over here for employment. The English have a

particularly quick eye for the profitable uses of money. They may not have great foresight in this respect, but directly an opening is actually ready to be taken advantage of, they are pretty sure to see it. There could hardly be a more striking illustration of this than the trade of the Suez Canal. It was supposed that the Canal would restore the Oriental trade to the ports of Southern Europe; but in point of fact the English, who were to have been more or less ruined by it, have been the only people who have as yet got much good out of it. Up to the present time, the Canal has been mainly used by the English, for the simple reason that the English had not only the quickness to see, as soon as the thing was done, what use could be practically made of it, but the ready money at hand to build the only kind of vessels which can use the Canal profitably.

All this tends to make London enormously rich; but riches have their dangers, and we think that few people will be able to follow Mr. Bagehot in his account of the dangers which at present threaten the London Money Market with altogether an easy mind. The wealth of Lombard Street is borrowed wealth. By far the greater proportion of it is held by bankers or others on short notice or on demand, and it might all, or nearly all, be asked for any afternoon. If it were asked for in any considerable quantity, would the bankers be able to meet the demand? That is really the root-question, as the Germans would say, of the Money Market. And it is a question to which Mr. Bagehot certainly does not help us to any very hopeful or reassuring answer.

Lombard Street is, of course, an organization of credit, and it is important to observe how far credit is carried. The bankers receive the money of their customers, but they keep as little of it as possible lying by them. Bankers are both borrowers and lenders, and the money goes out almost as soon as it comes in. What money a bank cannot dispose of within its own sphere of operations, it passes on to some larger bank to be taken care of. The country bankers send their principal reserves to their London agents, and the London bankers send their reserves to the Bank of England. The custody of large sums in hard cash entails much care and some cost, and the same reasons which make it convenient for a private person to have a banker make it convenient for bankers to keep an account with another bank if they can. The country bankers keep in their tills only the minimum of cash necessary for their current every-day business. They send the rest to London, invest part of it in securities, and keep the balance with the London bankers and bill-brokers. What the London bankers and bill-brokers cannot turn to account they deposit in the Bank of England. "You always come back to the Bank of England at last," says Mr. Bagehot. But then the Bank of England is a bank too—not exactly like other banks, but still doing a banking business, and lending out much of the money that comes in. It is clear, therefore, that, if all the depositors in the country happened to take it into their heads to claim their deposits on the same day, they would not and could not get them on demand. The greater part of the money would be scattered about in the hands of people who had obtained advances from the banks, and this could not be got at in a hurry. But of course there is practically no need to provide for such a contingency as this. It may be taken for granted that everybody will not want his money at the same moment. It is enough that the banks should have at their command such an amount of ready money as would enable them on a reasonable calculation of probabilities to tide over an emergency of this kind. A panic is only a name for a sudden demand upon the bankers for hard cash. People take fright, distrust the credit of their agents, and ask to have their money given over into their own hands, so that they may see for themselves that it is really there. The question is what reserve of money is necessary in order to provide for a run of this kind. The country bankers trust to be able to get the money from London, and the London bankers trust to the Bank of England. In point of fact, however, the bankers' reserve funds are only in part to be found in the Bank of England. As soon as they are paid in there, the principal part of them at once goes out again into the hands of borrowers. "It may be broadly stated," says Mr. Bagehot, "that no bank in London or out of it holds any considerable sum in hard cash or legal tender (above what is wanted for its daily business) except the Banking Department of the Bank of England." And how much does the Bank of England hold? Not more on an average of years than some 40 per cent. of its liabilities. There is no fixed rule as to the amount of this reserve. It is just what the Directors of the Bank choose to make it. They are under no pledge or engagement as to how much it shall be, nor have they ever committed themselves by the disclosure of the principles on which they profess to deal with it. The Bank of England, as everybody knows, is limited as to the amount of notes which it can issue on Government securities, the rest of its issue being represented by actual bullion; but it is under no restraint or conditions as to the amount of its banking reserve. This reserve is the foundation of the whole credit system of the country; for the traders depend on the banks, and the banks on the Bank of England, and thus it depends on the discretion or indiscretion of the Directors of this one Joint-Stock Company for the time being whether the reserve shall be sufficient to meet the pressure of a panic, or, in other words, as Mr. Bagehot puts it, whether the country shall be solvent or insolvent. The Bank of England, it must be remembered, is a trading company, and the shareholders are by no means satisfied with their profits. The Bank of England earns only nine per cent., while

the London and Westminster Bank earns twenty per cent.; but one of the reasons why the dividend of the former is lower is that it keeps a reserve of some forty per cent. of its deposits lying idle for the security of the latter, which thereupon cuts down its reserve to thirteen per cent.

It can hardly be denied that there is a real and serious danger in this state of things, but it is much easier to point out the evil than to devise a remedy. Mr. Bagehot seems to think that some sort of definite obligation should be imposed on the Bank in regard to the amount of its banking reserve, but he admits that he can suggest nothing more definite than an "apprehensive minimum" which cannot be defined. On the other hand, the Directors of the Bank of England would probably argue that it is rather hard to expect them to keep a large reserve lying idle, in order to enable their rivals in business to beat them in dividends; and that the natural solution of the difficulty is that the banks which deposit their reserves with the Bank of England should make it worth the while of the latter to keep the money on hand for them if they object to its being lent out. The public at large, however, has an interest in the matter, and it is obvious that at present the public interest is not protected as it should be. The Bank of England occupies, it is true, to some extent, an artificial position, and when the worst comes to the worst there is always an opening for the Government to come to the rescue. But an organization of credit which has to depend for its safety on the intervention of the Government cannot be said to be in a satisfactory condition.

OLD CATHOLICS AND ULTRAMONTANES IN GERMANY.

THE plot thickens in Germany, and Church affairs seem rapidly hastening to a crisis. On the one hand, Prince Bismarck and his opponents in the State Church are openly marshalling their forces in battle array; on the other hand, the Old Catholics are increasing their numbers and completing their organization by the appointment of a missionary Bishop. There is, of course, a close connexion between the two movements within and without the lines of the established hierarchy, but it will be convenient to take them separately in order to put our readers in possession of the leading incidents of the struggle during the last few weeks. First, however, we may say a word on the case of Baron Richthofen, Canon of Breslau, which appears to have created a considerable sensation in Germany, as well owing to his social and ecclesiastical standing as to the summary proceedings adopted by the Prince Bishop. It was already well known that anti-infallibilists were to be found among the members of many German Chapters, as *e.g.*, those of Trèves, Cologne, and Rottenburg, though in some instances they had maintained a discreet silence, while in others, as at Rottenburg, the Bishop shrank from enforcing dogmas to which he had himself reluctantly submitted. But when, last month, Canon Richthofen issued his formal protest "for truth and conscience sake," the infallibilists were much disconcerted at so unexpected a rebuff from such a quarter. The Canon, who is forty-one years old, was formerly parish priest at Hohenfriedeberg, but was last year named by the Emperor to a canonry at Breslau, and the Prince Bishop, though aware of his sentiments, confirmed the appointment. From the first he was looked on with suspicion by the Romanizing members of the Chapter, but when he refused to sign the address against the new Church laws, and induced his friend Dr. Künzer to withdraw his signature, their indignation could no longer be repressed, though his pious and blameless life and amiable character had endeared him to the clergy generally. In his public declaration he refers to the ill-disguised doubts and scepticism and dishonest reserves in the infallibilist camp, among those who have formally submitted to the Vatican decrees, and their intense bitterness against all who have had the courage to avow their convictions. Bishop Förster, of whom we shall have a word to say presently, did not let the grass grow under his feet; possibly he hoped by striking promptly to anticipate the action of the new laws. Be that as it may, he proceeded at once without any of the intermediate canonical processes of admonition, citation, and the like, to deprive and excommunicate the offending member of his cathedral Chapter. Whether the Government will uphold him in his rights remains to be seen, but they can hardly escape the charge of manifest inconsistency if they fail to do so. And Prince Bismarck is not a man who would be willing to have it supposed that his bark is worse than his bite. It is clear at all events that, if he shows any sign of faltering, he will find the bishops more than a match for him.

We have before now given reasons for believing that there is not that entire unanimity in the German Episcopate which might appear on the surface, and that the public manifestoes issued periodically "from the tomb of St. Boniface" and elsewhere cannot safely be accepted as an adequate measure of the real sentiments of all who subscribe them. The memorial just addressed to the Government in the name of all the archbishops and bishops of Prussia requires therefore to be read with caution, and must await the interpretation of events. But, as far as words go, it is outspoken and uncompromising enough, and can only be viewed as an open declaration of war. The bishops announce with deep regret that "they are not in a position to co-operate in carrying out the laws promulgated on May 15," which violate the divine rights of the Church of God, and the recognized relations of Church and State from the days of Constantine to our own. They cannot acknowledge "the principle of the heathen State,"

which makes the civil authority supreme over the Church, without denying the divinity of Christ and the divine origin of Christianity, and they refuse to comply with those detailed provisions which are not in themselves objectionable, because they would by doing so recognize the competence of the State to regulate Church affairs by its own authority. Notwithstanding this very decided language, and the equally peremptory replies of the semi-official *Provincial Correspondent*, it is still the prevalent impression in Germany that matters will not come to an open rupture at present, and that if the Government shows tact in the application of its own measures, the bishops will be found more compliant in act than they have ventured to show themselves on paper. There is probably an unavowed disposition on both sides to rest—if not very thankfully—till the results of the next Papal Conclave are made known.

The Old Catholics meanwhile have not been inactive. Their numbers at Cologne alone are reported to have reached four thousand, and a second priest is to be appointed there. But their great achievement was the election of a bishop, on June 4th, at Cologne, in the person of Dr. Reinkens, whose reluctance to accept the office has at length been overcome. He is a man of mature age, widely respected for his learning and piety, and has the somewhat rare merit of combining deep knowledge with fervent enthusiasm and great oratorical power. As Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Breslau he was naturally brought into close personal contact with the Prince Bishop Förster, who was at Rome a leading member of the Opposition. Their present relations may be judged of from a circumstance which comes to us on the best authority, and which strikingly illustrates the true position of parties in the Roman Catholic Church. On the Prince Bishop's return from Rome after the Council, Dr. Reinkens, who was on intimate terms with him, appealed to him to maintain the protest he had there made against the new doctrines, and was not a little startled at his reply. The Bishop said he was too old and feeble to carry on the contest, and therefore meant to make his formal submission; but he added that there was so much latent scepticism and indifference in the Church at the present day that a conscientious struggle against the Vatican innovations would not have a fair chance of success; Catholics, as a rule, cared too little what they professed to believe to be willing to put themselves out about the matter. And he therefore advised Reinkens to follow his example, acquiesce in the dominant teaching, and await better days. To which the Professor replied, that he could not conscientiously take that course, and felt the more bound to speak out as there was an impression current in Germany that Catholic priests were dishonest men who did not really believe what they professed, and he for one would do nothing to countenance it. This conversation, as was natural, brought all friendly intercourse between them to an end; and Reinkens has since, if we remember rightly, been suspended and excommunicated by his diocesan like his colleagues. He is the author of several works bearing on Church history, but is perhaps best known to the general public by his treatise on *Papal Infallibility*, published in 1870, and a little work, entitled *Die päpstliche Dekrete*, published the year after the Council, in 1871, and noticed at the time in our columns. It may be interesting at this moment to recall the position he there takes up, which is at once that of strict dogmatic Catholicism and of uncompromising rejection of what he regards as novel additions to the deposit of faith—*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*—handed down from the first ages of the Church. He starts from the following as fundamental Catholic axioms:—

1. The revelation of Christian doctrine is summed up and completed for ever in Christ.
2. This doctrinal deposit is preserved from generation to generation exclusively and alone through the faith of the Universal Church (*Gesammte Kirche*), under the assistance of the Holy Ghost.
3. On this rests the Catholic principle of tradition, according to which what has not been believed at all times and by the whole Church does not appertain to that doctrinal deposit, and therefore can never become a formal dogma.
4. What is demonstrably contrary to what was held in any Christian century—as, e.g. the sixth—in the Universal Church, cannot at this day be made a dogma by any authority in heaven or earth without fundamentally destroying the Catholic Church.
5. The value of truth is absolute, and consciously to contradict it is the sin against the Holy Ghost.

Having laid down these axioms, "which no Catholic can dispute," Dr. Reinkens thus describes the aim of his first essay on the Vatican decrees:—

The sole object of the following pages is to exhibit clearly the true nature of the doctrine of the universal episcopate of the Pope contained in the Bull *Pastor Aeternus*, by comparing it with the doctrine of the Universal Church at the end of the sixth century, as sharply defined by Gregory the Great, that Father of the Church and competent witness of her doctrine, for the express purpose of guarding it from all attacks.

In the preface to the second part of his work he refers to his earlier volume on *Papal Infallibility*, and proposes to contrast the ancient and modern (Vatican) teaching on the subject. In the subsequent parts he treats of the irregular and illegitimate character of the Vatican Synod, and the conduct of the German bishops in "submitting" to the dogmas they had at first strenuously opposed, and seeking to enforce them on others.

The election of Dr. Reinkens, after the Mass of the Holy Ghost had been celebrated in St. Pantaleon's Church at Cologne, on June 4, appears to have been almost or quite unanimous. According to the "provisional ordinances" of the Old Catholic Commission, he is bound immediately after

consecration to seek the recognition of the Prussian Government, and take the prescribed oath. He will also apply for State recognition in other countries where he desires to exercise jurisdiction, and will, till it is obtained, confine himself to the "functions of order," i.e., sacramental and liturgical acts. In the government of the Old Catholic communities he will be assisted by a Council of four clerics and five laymen, to be annually chosen by the Synod, at whose meetings he will preside and have a casting vote. The Council for the present year is already formed, and includes Schulte, Reusch, and Knoodt. The Synod will assemble regularly in Whitsun week and at other times when it may be necessary; the first meeting to be held at Whitsuntide, 1874. It will consist of all the Catholic clergy and one lay delegate for each congregation of not less than one hundred or over two hundred members. Smaller congregations will unite to send a delegate, and those of over three hundred members may elect two. Congregations will elect their own pastors, who will be confirmed and instituted by the bishop.

There may possibly be some short delay in the consecration of Dr. Reinkens, as the death of Archbishop Loos, the venerable and venerated primate of the Church of Holland, was announced on the very day of his election. Our readers will remember that the Archbishop, who had held the see of Utrecht for fifteen years, has all along shown a warm and intelligent interest in the Old Catholic movement; he was present at the Cologne Congress last September, and one of his latest acts was to ordain two young students from Germany to the priesthood. The suffragan see of Haarlem happens also to be vacant, and it is therefore thought probable that Dr. Reinkens will be at once consecrated by the Bishop of Deventer, without waiting for the election of a new archbishop. It is rumoured that the Prussian Government intends to provide a salary, but we have seen no official intimation to that effect.

THE SCIENCE OF ADVERTISING.

NO doubt every form of human effort tends to culminate. In this belief exhibitions are held and prizes offered. One often hears of the very best joke, and of the finest baby. There is no artist or author whose friends cannot show him his greatest work, marking the zenith of his powers, toward which all previous efforts are seen to have been a painful struggle, and from which all subsequent attempts have betrayed a falling away; though this point is not to be dwelt on, but only confessed and regretted. Every one is told in childhood, as an item of knowledge which should be found in every well-instructed mind, that Solomon was the wisest man who ever lived; and although some may afterwards call this in question, it still remains the prevalent opinion, inasmuch that few can deny it without a feeling not unlike that of looking over a precipice. Solomon, in fact, is for most people the embodiment of that ideal philosopher who, Kant assures us, haunts the mind of every man. On the other hand, Mr. Carlyle bids us consider that there exists somewhere the very foolishest person; and if this person has never been identified, it is perhaps by reason of the perplexing multitude of candidates for the distinction. Our present purpose is to commend the following advertisement as, if not the best that ever has been or will be issued (since it is impossible to set limits to the fecundity and force of nature), a fine specimen of its kind, and an instructive example to epic poets and other wordy persons how great merit may be attained in small compass. It runs thus:—

Some Extraordinary Tea

is now being sold by ——— & Co. have great pleasure in offering to the public some really choice Kyshow Congou of extraordinary quality—in fact, some of the finest tea ever imported into England.

——— & Co. in all their experience have seldom met with tea of such rare excellence.

Here it may be seen that tea, like other things, tends to culminate, and that there may be better and worse even in Kyshow Congou itself. But this by the way. Never that we are aware did any advertisement induce us to buy what we did not want; but this one came very near it. For some time it dwelt in our minds, working unobtrusively. Already in imagination we went to see what that tea was like. Its sweet idea wandered through our thoughts. In all our experience (to imitate what we admire) we have seldom met with an advertisement of such rare excellence, such effective rhetoric. So, remembering what authors tell us so frequently, that it is the part of a critic to praise as well as blame, we felt that it became a duty to extol this masterpiece. And, remembering again what we are sometimes told, that a critic should not be a mere empirical taster (like one who gives the palm to Kyshow Congou), but should be able to assign a reason for his judgment, we proceed to offer ours.

In attempting this, we are sensible of the disadvantage of being unable to refer to any authority on the subject. For, when Blair wrote, advertisements had not become such a considerable branch of literature as to entitle the art of composing them to particular notice in his ingenious Lectures; and none of his successors has yet made up the deficiency. Trusting to the light of nature, however, and checking *à priori* speculation by consulting the works of the great masters in this department (since here as elsewhere practice precedes reflection), it seems safe to say that the first requisite of an advertisement is that it should be striking—noticeable as a whole, and its important clauses especially salient. To the superficial thinker our masterpiece apparently fails to fulfil this first condition of excellence in

its kind. But meditation discovers a deeper conformity. We might have expected our attention to be challenged by a Chinese picture of a Mandarin standing near a river and handing a cup of Kyshow Congou to a damsel sitting in the fourth story of a pagoda on the opposite bank. Instead of this we have a simple decorous tablet bearing black letters on a white ground, not unsuitable for a tombstone. The reconciliation of the seeming discrepancy is that when the principle of salience has long been adhered to and followed in one direction, pictures and glaring colours become commonplace and tiresome, and modesty is conspicuous as a surprise and relief.

Moreover the principle of salience is controlled by other principles, particularly by that of relativity, which has two aspects. The complexion of advertisements must vary relatively to the persons addressed and to the thing advertised. It is not enough to strike, since some strokes are far from propitiatory. How often has a slap on the back destroyed the life of the friendship which it was meant to revive! An advertisement must not strike, as you strike a ball, to drive it away, but rather as you strike a trout, to draw it to you. To address free-born Britons in the peremptory tone—"Buy your boots here or there"—betrays gross ignorance of national character. It is very questionable whether any man could make a good boot who had so little discernment of the fitness of things. Again, impertinent interrogatories in vain appeal to a class whose interest is above trifles. In them the demand "Who is Williams?" only excites the response "Know thyself!" Evidently notes of exclamation repel the polite; whilst subtleties of finesse are thrown away upon the vulgar. Further, as has been said, the style appropriate to any advertisement depends on what is advertised. The following struck us the other day as gratuitously revolting—"A thousand heads wanted for a thousand hats!" It out-Herods Herodias; though there is nothing necessarily bloodthirsty about the business of a hatter. Or who would not shudder to see the advertisement of a library on sale printed in orange letters on a green ground, or headed with the picture of some painful person reading Herbert or Sidney as if to a mob at a fair? Rather should such signals of distress be bordered deep with mourning, as if the auctioneer himself consented to the separation with averted face; or they might present one black expanse of printer's ink with letters where his tears (the auctioneer's) had washed a dubious white.

On trying our masterpiece by these principles its extraordinary quality becomes indisputable. For tea, as De Quincey says, is the favourite beverage of the intellectual. Choice teas, too, and teas of rare excellence will only be bought by those to whom they afford a high gratification, or who are ready to pay a great price for a small one. We might say of any exceptional luxury that it was Kyshow Congou to the general. Moreover, regarded as a luxury, tea is rather an æsthetic than a sensual delight. Its preparation is the fine-art department of cookery. The celestial leaf is much out of place among the commodities of a grocery establishment. The druggist seems a more suitable vendor; an ancient bookseller or picture-dealer is still more to be preferred; but the herb (so its lovers name it, as smokers call tobacco the weed) is only worthily honoured at a store sacred to itself. Perfectly consonant with all this is the style of our masterpiece. Observe its plain candour and measured conscientiousness, as of men offering to trade in nectar with the gods—

In regions mild of calm and serene air,
Above the smoke and stir of this dim spot
Which men call earth—

far beyond the reach of competition and the higgling of the market. No price is mentioned. It is not prompted by that propensity to truck and barter which the great forefather of English economists (*Adam Smith*, as they always piously call him) found to be inherent in human nature; but is conceived in a mingled spirit of scientific judgment and æsthetic ardour. Let us scrutinize it more closely; let us subject it to the analysis of a loving criticism, which it is well able to hear.

Of the chastity of its form and effects in the way of colour and printing enough has been said. We pass to matters more strictly literary, to what some would call the "choice of words"; though we object to that phrase as savouring of the age of mechanism, and ill expressing the spontaneous growth of such a flower of language. Consider the word "extraordinary"; pronounce it withunction, and mark the deliberate length and judicial calm of that second syllable. It lingers in the mind, and compels circumspection. If, whilst dwelling on it for half a minute, it should seem after all not to be the right vocable, there is still time to withdraw it and substitute a better. Note next that — & Co. have "great pleasure" in offering us their Kyshow Congou. They do not say they are "glad"—a business-like and unfeeling expression; nor that they are "honoured," for they stand in the position of benefactors, and it is not a time for servility. Fresh from tasting the foreign wonder, they have great pleasure alike in the remembrance of its unearthly fragrance, and in their confident anticipation of the customer's sympathy. Thus Eve approached our forefather with the fruit of that forbidden tree. Then the Miltonic placing of Kyshow Congou here! One seems to be caught away in a whirlwind from the smoke and stir of this dim spot, and set down amidst the ancient and leisurely industries of a Chinese tea plantation. What a resonance too in those words, not without onomatopoeic merits, as if it were the banging of some prodigious kettle! And what mystery! they might be the burden of a witch's incantation droned to the

accompaniment of her simmering cauldron. We think the firm must keep a tame poet. If so, the genius of that domesticated animal culminates in the last paragraph, beginning "—— & Co. in all their experience." Here we have a pensive strain. It seems never to have been meant to meet the public eye, but reads like a memorandum in a private diary, which a hypochondriac has entered with a sigh. "In all their experience"—think of the thousands and thousands of cups of tea which constitute the Firm's experience, and what a labour (of love perhaps) it must have been to confront a sample of this cargo with all its predecessors, before they could know that they had seldom met with tea of such rare excellence. We figure to ourselves the Firm assembled in a dim back parlour for the great consultation; brothers, and three in number—though on this point we have no knowledge, but it seems right, since three witches prepare the cauldron in *Macbeth*. The brew perfected, they sip together. The flavour takes its way into the recesses of their imagination, where the pale ghosts of departed samples rise up to welcome it; flavour on flavour piled about their heads like cloud on cloud. Then the work of comparison; the painstaking indifferently to administer justice, to give their due alike to new and old; not to let their judgment be overpowered by the greater vividness of the present impression, nor yet to allow too much for the effacements of time; not to be led astray by love of novelty, nor yet by superstitious reverence for antiquity. It is on account of this last consideration that the first brother says, with a faint notion that he is quoting Bacon, "This flavour is the true ancient," and is then glad to see that the others are too deeply absorbed to notice whether the allusion is apposite.

And now observe the public spirit of the advertisers. Having at last assured themselves of the rare excellence of this tea, there were three courses open to them. First, they might have kept it all to themselves, to serve as a sort of imperial standard to which the qualities of other teas might be referred, thus saving themselves for the future such labours of comparison by establishing and maintaining in their minds a pure and lofty idea of what a cup of tea should be like. Secondly, they might have given it away in Christmas presents to their old customers. And if it had been in the least less extraordinary than it is, it is just possible that their lower natures would have urged them to one of these courses. But Kyshow Congou, being such as it was, triumphed over every base impulse; and the Firm, in its enthusiasm, resolved on offering it to the public at large, merely putting a price on it to prevent its getting into the tenpots of the unappreciative.

Still, with all its excellences, the advertisement contains one or two flaws. To say that this tea is "in fact some of the finest ever imported into England" is perhaps going beyond the evidence. For the experience of the Firm cannot reach so far back, unless by hereditary transmission. Again, why is this Kyshow Congou said to be "really choice"? If choice at all, it must, we conceive, be really so. "Really" seems here to be a mere expletive; a weak attempt to gain emphasis by redundancy of words. This is a rhetorical artifice unworthy of genius, and we hope to see the blemish removed in future editions.

MR. LOWE AND THE ZANZIBAR MAIL CONTRACT.

TWO important general principles are involved in the question which has been raised as to the contract for the conveyance of the mails between the Cape of Good Hope and Zanzibar. This contract was the result of a private agreement, and it is maintained that it ought to have been thrown open to public competition. Mr. Lowe not only disputes this position, but contends that matters of this kind ought to be left entirely to the Government, and that the House of Commons ought not to meddle with them at all. To transfer the responsibility of entering into such contracts from the Government to the House of Commons would, he argued, lead to personal solicitations, "lobbying," and other proceedings which he should be sorry to see introduced into this country. Most people will be disposed to agree with Mr. Lowe that it would be a great pity to have such practices introduced into the House of Commons; but, on the other hand, it can hardly be said that the Government should have absolute authority to enter into whatever contracts it chooses without check or supervision on the part of the House of Commons. Formerly the rule was that packet contracts made by the Government were binding unless disapproved by the House of Commons; but the present rule is that contracts are not binding until they have received Parliamentary endorsement. For this change the present Government, we believe, is responsible; and if Mr. Lowe does not like the system, he has his colleagues, and we suppose himself also, to blame for it. It is quite certain that no contract ever was or will be entered into to the satisfaction of everybody. Disappointed competitors are sure to find fault with the terms of a bargain in which their rivals have got the better of them, and there can never be much difficulty in discovering plausible reasons why the contract should in some respect or other have been different from what it is. In the present instance the object of the Government was to put down the slave trade on the East coast of Africa by means of a postal contract. This may seem rather a roundabout process, but there is something to be said for it. The Government had attempted to suppress this abominable traffic by armed force, and had not made much progress. It had spent a quarter of a million in this way in five years, and it was anxious to see whether some

more economical treatment could not be devised. After considering the matter, it came to the conclusion that it might be well to try the effect of pacific measures. It was thought that the cultivation of regular commerce would drive out the slave trade, and that the best way of cultivating commerce would be by establishing a line of steamers between Aden, Zanzibar, and the Cape. As an encouragement to the steamers a postal subsidy was proposed. Negotiations resulted in agreements with the Indian Steam Company to carry the Aden and Zanzibar mails for 10,000*l.*, and with the Union Steam Company to convey the mails between Zanzibar and the Cape for 15,000*l.* a year. It was further arranged with the latter Company that, if they reduced the length of the journey between England and the Cape from thirty-seven to thirty days, they should have an extension of their contract, which had four and a half years to run, for three and a half years more, at the rate of 26,000*l.* a year, instead of 20,000*l.*, which they were then receiving. Subsequently it was decided to drop the latter part of the bargain—that as to the conveyance of mails between England and the Cape—and the Government then agreed to reopen the question as to the terms of the remaining service. It was held that the two contracts which had been entered into with the Union Steam Company were really parts of the same bargain, and must stand and fall together, since it was only on account of the advantages to be derived from the second contract that the Company had agreed to perform the first so cheaply. The end of fresh negotiations was that the Government consented to pay 26,000*l.* for the conveyance of the mails between the Cape and Zanzibar, which the Company had before agreed to do for 15,000*l.*

The particular question before the House of Commons on Monday night was whether there was any reason why the Government should pay the Union Steam Company 26,000*l.* for a service which the Company had been willing and eager to perform for 15,000*l.* a few months earlier. On what grounds was this bonus of 11,000*l.* given to the Company? The only explanation which Mr. Lowe offered was that in the first instance the contract for the mails between Zanzibar and the Cape, and the contract for the mails between the Cape and England, balanced each other, and that the Company could afford to accept very low terms for the former, in consequence of the advantages they would derive from the other part of the transaction. This, however, would seem to be only shifting the difficulty. Why should the terms for the conveyance of the mails from the Cape to England have been so high, and the terms for the Zanzibar and Cape mails so low? Since there were two contracts, it would surely have been reasonable to apportion the expenses of each service in accordance with its actual cost. If we take the Zanzibar and Cape contract by itself, 11,000*l.* is certainly a very considerable advance on a contract at the rate of 15,000*l.* But, says Mr. Lowe, this 11,000*l.* is compensation to the Company for the withdrawal of the other contract. And here we come upon another aspect of the matter. This second contract was for the conveyance of the English mails at a reduction of 3,000*l.* a year, with an accelerated speed. At first sight this might seem a very good bargain for the country, but if it was a good bargain, why has it been abandoned? And if it was really a bad bargain, so bad a bargain that it has been thought worth while to give the Company 11,000*l.* a year under another head to get out of it, what are we to think of the terms of the existing contract at the rate of 29,000*l.* a year? It must strike any one that this is not a business-like and straightforward way of making contracts. The two mail services were separate things, and they should have been each estimated at their natural value. It is, on the face of the transaction, childish to stick on 11,000*l.* to one contract in order to make another contract 11,000*l.* less. An addition of three-fourths to the terms of the first contract is a serious advance for which no adequate reason has been given, and on the whole we are led to the conclusion that the matter was carelessly or unskillfully managed by the Government. The most extraordinary part of the affair is that the Treasury should have been ignorant that the British India Steam Navigation Company had offered to perform the Zanzibar and Cape service for 16,315*l.* The offer was made to the Post Office, and it was known to the Colonial Office, for it is mentioned in one of Lord Kimberley's despatches; yet the Chancellor of the Exchequer never heard a whisper of it till Monday night, when it came upon him quite by surprise. It appears that the offer of the British India Steam Company in 1871 was not a formal tender for an independent service, but only a proposal to include the Zanzibar mails as part of the general Indian contract. Yet it is strange that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should never have heard of it.

As far as this particular transaction is concerned, we are disposed to think that the Government has been in fault, and that the contract is rather an extravagant one. It certainly looks very much as if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had discovered that the extension of the contract for the English mails was a mistake, and had found it necessary to offer a high figure for the Zanzibar and Cape contract in order to get out of the scrape. If Mr. Lowe had frankly confessed this—assuming it to be the fact—or if he had defended the contract on its own merits, he would no doubt have escaped from the humiliating position in which he was placed on Monday night. No Government is infallible, and mistakes will sometimes happen in regard to contracts as in regard to other things. When a mistake happens, if it is not a very serious one, there is no need to say too much about it. There can be no doubt, however, that Mr. Lowe fell into a

characteristic error in beginning his explanation by scolding the members who asked for it, and accusing them of "lobbying." As a general rule, it is certainly not desirable that the House of Commons should meddle with such matters. It is much better that they should be dealt with by the Government on its own responsibility, and that members should hold aloof from interference with transactions of the merits of which they are extremely ill qualified to judge. It is not a pretty sight to see the House of Commons split up into factions over a trumpery contract, and wrangling and squabbling as to whether the job shall go to the client of one set of members or to the client of another. Mr. Lowe was wrong in using the word "lobbying," which carries with it the imputation of corruption; but it requires very little reflection to see that it is not good for members to be exposed to the sort of solicitation and pressure which would be brought to bear on them if it were to become a regular practice for the House of Commons to take upon itself the duty of distributing Government patronage. No doubt the Government will occasionally make mistakes, but the harm done by an occasional mistake of this kind is insignificant compared with the mischief which would arise from members mixing themselves up with candidates for contracts, and serving them as spokesmen and touters. The Government is a great buyer and seller; there is scarcely any trade with which it has not commercial relations in one way or another; and the only difference between a mail contract and an order for coals or iron is that the former probably involves a larger sum of money. But the House of Commons has just as much right to look into one as into the other, and it is easy to conceive what would happen if the House once gave way to an impulse of meddlesomeness in this direction. It is no doubt necessary that the House should reserve to itself the right of ultimate supervision over the making of contracts and other mercantile dealings of the Government, but it is obvious that this is a right which should be exercised with the greatest delicacy and caution, and as seldom as possible. A numerous and mixed assembly is quite unfit to sit in judgment on nice questions of commercial expediency, and its intervention should be reserved for very grave occasions. As to the question whether contracts should be made by open competition or private agreement, no absolute rule can be laid down. Sometimes one way will be better, and sometimes the other, and the choice may fairly be left to the discretion of the Executive. It is obvious, however, that private bargaining ought not to preclude inquiries as to the terms on which more than one firm or Company would be willing to undertake a contract.

THE DESTRUCTION OF ALEXANDRA PALACE.

THE destruction by fire of the Alexandra Palace is in every point of view lamentable. Without expressing any very warm sympathy with the undertaking, we may at least say that it was likely to do good and could not easily do harm. The opening on the 24th of May was the result of a heavy expenditure of money and a long and honourable perseverance under severe difficulties and discouragements. The site of the Palace was probably the best that could have been selected. The view from Muswell Hill is superb, and the park and fields around it are adorned with timber of rare beauty. Access to the Palace from the north of London was ready, and from other parts of London convenient, although rather slow. You could cross by railway from the Crystal Palace on the south to the rival institution on the north if you took time enough for your journey. From the high-level station of the Crystal Palace you would pass to Ludgate Hill, thence by Farringdon Street to the Great Northern Station at King's Cross, and thence to the station adjoining Alexandra Palace. In speaking on the 31st ult. of railway access to Alexandra Palace, we noticed that trains from Ludgate Hill and Farringdon Street to King's Cross "cross the line" of the Metropolitan Railway close to the King's Cross Station. This expression may have conveyed an erroneous idea. All these trains pass under the Metropolitan line, so that they cannot interfere with the traffic upon this line. This arrangement is indeed tolerably well understood, but still any possible misapprehension as to safety of transit might have tended to deter visitors from the Alexandra Palace. Unhappily, there is now no Palace to be visited; and the charms of grass and trees in the Park are deformed by the blackened ruins which it surrounds. We have one big building the less to exhibit to the Shah of Persia, but we can tell him, if we please, that the Palace which has been destroyed cost half a million sterling, and there is already talk of spending another half-million to rebuild it. The Metropolitan and suburban railways are not perhaps wonders of scientific engineering, for it has for some time appeared possible to make any railway for which money can be found; but they exemplify in a very distinct and striking manner the wealth and energy of London, and its need, or at least its determination, to have rapid and regular communication. At Farringdon Street a Great Northern train is on the left or near side of the Metropolitan line and on a level with it; at King's Cross the same train is on the right side of the same line and on a level with it. Thus the train has descended into the bowels of the earth and risen again from them. This sort of thing can hardly be seen except in London. It does not exist elsewhere, because the necessity for it does not exist. In countries where nobody is ever in a hurry level crossings are almost invariable. In England, or at least in London in the month of June, nobody

is ever at leisure. The demands of business are urgent, and those of pleasure are more urgent still. We block our streets with carts and carriages, and construct railways one under another to relieve our streets. A stranger who desired to estimate the resources of this country would do well to make a journey from Upper Norwood to Muswell Hill. He might not perhaps see much beauty, but he would be assisted to understand how an English Company became rulers of India.

Sudden and complete destruction has resulted from neglect of obvious precautions. A slight and readily inflammable structure was placed upon a hill where water supply would be difficult even if the best possible arrangements were made for it. The Palace was completed and opened in a hurry, and calamity occurred before measures had been taken to avert or mitigate it. When we lately remarked on the inconvenience of exhibiting pictures and other works of art on a hill six miles from London, it did not occur to us to consider the risk they incurred of an almost irreparable loss. The Fire Brigade sent a strong detachment as speedily as possible to the Palace, but, having an uphill journey of several miles, they did not reach their destination until ruin was almost complete. They found an indifferent supply of water. If there had been a good supply of water and steam fire-engines at hand from the first, the fire might have been kept within narrow limits. But in the absence of such provisions it was uncontrollable. A piece of charcoal let fall from a plumber's brazier "found its way between the papier-mâché and light timber lining of the roof." A building thus constructed must be in peril of destruction from every act of carelessness. Papier-mâché and light timber lining are perhaps inevitable in what is called a Palace; and, if so, the risk of exhibiting valuable pictures in a Palace must, under the most careful management, be considerable. The central dome burned vigorously. The flames spread all ways along the roof, and burning fragments began to fall upon the floor. The draperies of the Royal box, the fittings of the orchestra, the baskets of artificial flowers, are all mentioned as feeding and forwarding the flames. There was not much to burn, but everything was easily accessible. The spectacle of this conflagration, which was very grand while it lasted, finished in about two hours. Looking at the character of the building, it is not wonderful that the owners were unable to insure it and its contents to anything near their value. A fire may occur anywhere, but there are only few situations where a fire involves almost inevitably the destruction of property worth half a million. A report in the *Times* states that Captain Shaw expressed to the writer his astonishment "that any large building should ever have been erected on the summit of a hill without an adequate supply of water having been ensured in the beginning." It was the first condition of safety to provide adequate pumping power from the New River which is at the foot of Muswell Hill to the Palace on the top of it. If the light structure would not carry water-tanks in the roof, it ought to have been strengthened.

While the ruins of the Alexandra Palace were still smoking, the authorities of the Crystal Palace held a grand commemoration fête on the nineteenth anniversary of its opening by the Queen. Not having been present, we cannot tell how we might have been impressed; but looking merely at reports, we should say that the unveiling of a statue of Sir Joseph Paxton, even if it be called an inauguration, could not have been a very imposing or exhilarating ceremony. The oration of Mr. Scott Russell seems to have shared the fate of other vocal performances at Palaces—that hardly anybody could hear it except by taking a place long beforehand, which perhaps was scarcely worth while. The speaker is reported to have described his departed friend as having devoted his highest energies to securing the well-being and the moral and mental improvement of the people. This is, we suppose, a fine way of saying that he invented the Exhibition Building of 1851, and thereby ensured the success of the Exhibition of which "Her Majesty's Commissioners" are a relic that encumbers and afflicts the earth. At some distant time, when Cole C.B. shall have ceased his civilizing labours there will be statues of that eminent teacher and benefactor of his age to be unveiled and inaugurated, and the only question will be, where to find an orator competent to pronounce his eulogy. The day at the Crystal Palace was brought to a close by a "splendid display of fireworks," which must have been a tame affair compared with the fireworks of the day before, in which the Directors of the Alexandra Palace expended half a million of money. It is but a small matter to be unveiling a memorial of Sir Joseph Paxton at the Crystal Palace, when the managers of the International Exhibition have promised to produce the real live Shah of Persia at a fête. If we remember rightly, the Sultan of Turkey went to the Crystal Palace, but that was before a younger institution had appropriated official and Court patronage to itself. It is almost pathetic to read of the performance at the Crystal Palace of a "Commemorative Ode in memory of the Prince Consort." The Directors maintain an unequal contest. They are forced to rely upon the fact that the Queen opened the Crystal Palace nineteen years ago, whereas the Prince of Wales is at this moment a manager of the International Exhibition. The memory of the Prince Consort has become a valuable property of analogous nature to a trade-mark or trade-name; and we should not be surprised to hear that the Court of Chancery was engaged in determining a conflict between the genuine original old-established commemorators of the Prince Consort at Sydenham and the new and improved but piratical

commemorators at South Kensington. It seems to be settled that the Shah of Persia is to be taken to the Western shop. We can only hope that he will not depart under the belief that the Prince of Wales and the Duke of Edinburgh are shopkeepers.

The International Exhibitioners having built for themselves a permanent habitation, we are not liable to have any more Palaces wandering about the country and locating themselves on the tops of hills where there is a free current of air and a limited supply of water. It is a pity that the building of 1862 could not have been pulled to pieces and forgotten, as in that case the idea of this luckless Palace on Muswell Hill would never have been started. However, the Directors have declared their determination to rebuild, and Messrs. Bertram and Roberts announce that they have saved their wine and much of their other stock and plant, and that the business of supplying dinners will be carried on in the Park. Brave men contending with adverse fate furnish a sublime spectacle, and Britons may well be proud of Messrs. Kelk and Lucas standing amid the ruins of the building in which they were so largely interested, and declaring that the only thing to be done is to rebuild it. The architect whom they employ will doubtless be particularly careful to shut the stable-door now that the steed is stolen. They will adopt, or think that they have adopted, the most elaborate precautions against fire, and perhaps they may induce owners of pictures to allow them to be exhibited in their new building, and perhaps they may not. When we hear that a building has been made "fire-proof," we infer that certain dangers have been incurred in the hope of avoiding others. The tie-rods of the dome of the Alexandra Palace gave way, as such things always do, and the dome fell with a tremendous crash. These tie-rods were, we presume, of iron, which always gives way under such circumstances. Wood covered with plaster is safer than iron, but wood is generally unsuitable for the airy structure of a Palace. It has been often said of loan exhibitions that the pictures are at least as safe in a public gallery as in the owners' houses. But after the narrow escape of this week that assertion will not perhaps be so readily accepted as it used to be.

ORIENTALS AT VIENNA.

THE anticipations with regard to the appearance made by Orientals at Vienna will be realized to the full, and doubtless the contact between East and West will prove of mutual advantage. In fact, the peculiarly happy situation of the Austrian capital has not only given this Exhibition its distinctive character, but has developed its proportions in a degree that has falsified all the original calculations. It soon became evident that circumstances would take it out of the category of those which had preceded it; that it might open new markets which were practically limitless, and that it would throw new and valuable lights upon hackneyed and familiar subjects. It was seen that it would reproduce, on an immeasurably greater scale, such cosmopolitan gatherings of traders as assemble at the great fairs of Leipsic or Nizni Novgorod; that it would drag into open day the rarer contents of Oriental bazaars, and expose them side by side with the goods produced in Western manufactories and sold by Western shopkeepers. There would be unrivalled opportunities of making comparisons and drawing conclusions, of learning practical lessons and exploding antiquated prejudices. So it seems likely to prove; nor will either half of the world have much reason to triumph over the other. We need not advertise the wonders of our Western civilization. If we are not much in the way of boasting of them as against the benighted East, it is simply because we enjoy the serene self-complacency of indisputable superiority. To a certain extent we are justified by the results of a rapidly accelerating progress, which shows itself in the swift growth of our material prosperity. We work at the highest pressure; we invoke science to our assistance, and foster a restless rivalry that drives invention forward at express speed; we multiply labour by the introduction of mechanical improvements; and we supply our homes with luxuries that have become necessities at extraordinarily economical rates. In short, we produce quickly and cheaply, and in all that relates to action we leave the dreamy East immeasurably behind, as the Easterns are ready enough to acknowledge, and, for the most part, rather with commiseration than envy. But, on the other hand, in much that is highest and most perfect in art we are the scholars and they the teachers. Our best-informed and most experienced technical and practical men are the most ready to acknowledge this. It is not wealthy connoisseurs and capricious dilettanti who lounge about the courts of Japan, China, and Turkey, cheapening the strangely attractive wares which are exposed by the merchants from those distant countries. It is the European manufacturers and tradesmen—especially the English—who rush into the Eastern departments, eagerly bidding against each other for everything that strikes their fancy. This is one of the most characteristic features of the Vienna Exhibition. On no previous occasion of the kind has there been such wholesale buying and selling in the very earliest days, and the traffic goes forward most briskly in the Oriental quarters. As yet Japan has not cleared her goods at the Custom-house; China has scarcely imported the better part of hers. Those countries cannot as yet pretend to set a price upon their wares, while the prices fixed by the Persians seem high enough in all conscience, and the Ottomans are following suit after the time-honoured fashion of Eastern dealers. Yet already the choicest of the

Persian prayer-carpet are snatched up at the high prices set upon them; the best of the Japanese porcelain, bronzes, *cloisonnée* ware, and silks have been sold several times over, the charges being left to the conscience of the Commissioners, and the cards of the fortunate purchaser lying on the fragments of the torn tickets that had been affixed by rejected bidders; while even in Turkey and Tunis, which come far behind Japan and Persia in taste and quality of workmanship, many of the goods have changed owners already, the Prince of Wales being among the earliest and most considerable buyers.

The truth is, the more closely we look into the special productions of the East, the more we recognize its incontestable superiority in design and colour, and in perfection of form and finish. The Orientals have plenty of time no doubt, and do not grudge it; they can afford to work leisurely and carefully where we must economize labour by the rapidity of our processes and the multiplying power of our machinery. But then they have taste as well, and a taste which is older than schools of art, and seems nearly independent of technical education. Compare the graceful turbans and draperies of the Oriental with the stiff "chimney-pot," cutaway, and trousers of the Frank. The latter, although open to criticism even as convenient wear, doubtless look more like business. They give the idea of stripping easily for a hard day's work, and suggest readiness to answer the calls of any emergency. They are turned out comparatively cheaply to cut-and-dry patterns. The former are the signs of a languid yet not unfruitful existence. But they express the intuitive gracefulness of ideas evolved in a calm fulness of thought that will not be hurried; they show an originality and versatility of fancy whose inspirations may have been sought in the dreamy fumes of opium. Go to the remotest East of Asia, seek the Oriental on his own proper ground, and you seldom take him at a disadvantage. In his own unpretending way, the peasant who weaves mats of bamboo or moulds vessels of common clay in his retired village is as much of an artist as the skilled workman of Yeddo who lacquers cabinets in the most delicate plaques of veneer, or chases the bronze incense-burners that are to swing in the temples. When the Oriental breaks down is when he takes to imitating the European, as he has begun to do in these latter days. The Japanese sometimes turn from their own beautiful specimens of Kago and Satsuma porcelain to reproduce the fashions and colours of Parisian and English crockery, while the Turks back their clumsy machinery against the looms of Manchester in calicoes and cottons. Happily these follies of imitation are as yet rare; and probably the profits of this novel trade will not encourage the enterprising imitators to persevere. The East has much to learn from the West, and the lessons that will prove of most service to it go to the very groundwork of its society. It has yet to be enlightened as to the advantages of civil and religious liberty and education, the value of time, and the necessity of system and method. All this it is now learning, and in some matters of detail its education is going on only too rapidly. Doubtless sooner or later it will come to our markets for machinery which will enable it to make at home what it imports at present from abroad. But some of its tentative advances in this direction are premature and injudicious, to say the least, and, judging by certain samples of its imitative skill, it seems inclined to precipitate a competition whose unfortunate results in price and quality may cause it permanent discouragement.

However, it is not our purpose now to discuss the points on which we may teach the Orientals, but rather to glance at some of those where we are the scholars. There is a great deal in the Eastern departments of the Vienna Exhibition which is chiefly interesting as showing their relative backwardness. Some of them, for instance, send complete samples of their cereals and vegetable productions, and these are curious as illustrating the advantages of soil and climate which yield them, in spite of the most backward husbandry and the most primitive implements, returns of twenty, fifty, or a hundred fold. But only turn to their show in the arts, and some of them may almost set criticism at defiance. By general consent and beyond all comparison, the first place must be assigned to Japan. The Japanese does most things unlike the rest of the world. His method of handling his tools is precisely the opposite of ours. He draws his plane towards him, works his saw in the reverse direction, taps with the side of his queer hammer, and handles his quaintly chased graving tool in a way at which an English workman would stare. Yet, whether he is laying the shingles on the roof of a cottage or chasing one of those wonderfully elaborate caskets in metal-work, what English workman can approach him? His ideas discover an endless originality; individual impulse rather than education seems to inspire his fancy, although it may work according to received traditions of the quaint or beautiful; and, look where we will through a most miscellaneous collection, we can scarcely see a trace of servile repetition. In his pictorial art he can convey a world of expression and suggestion in the very smallest number of touches. Yet when it pleases him to finish, as when he is painting on his delicate porcelain, he is scarcely to be surpassed in harmonious minuteness. As for his colours, you may puzzle out his secret if you can; at least he shows you in an open case the chemicals which, as he professes, form his ingredients. All that can be said is that none of the numerous attempts at imitation have ever proved to be anything approaching a success. That strange superiority in colour, not only in the tints, but in their management, is to be remarked in every one of the Oriental Courts. The silks of China excel even

those of Japan, in their bright blues and gorgeous crimson; while for softened brilliancy and exquisite delicacy of blending the Persian carpets are confessedly unequalled. The invariably subdued beauty of these patterns argues something more than great mechanical perfection in the arts of colour-making and dyeing. It is proof of a general purity of taste on the part of the Oriental purchasers for whom the fabrics were originally intended; for, although many of the best may now be consigned to Europe, the manufacture precisely as we see it has been practised from time immemorial; there are carpets in the Exhibition called modern by comparison, although they may date back for a century or so, and these are of patterns exactly similar to the latest ones. In everything exhibited from China and Persia the work is almost invariably good, and the designs felicitous; although, except in certain specialties, they cannot vie with Japan, yet every now and then one stumbles upon something that is extremely beautiful in art. So much can hardly be said of Turkey. Turkey makes a very imposing display; the Sultan contributed 100,000*l.* towards forming the collection, and some of the great merchants in Constantinople, Smyrna, and elsewhere have apparently done their best to advertise themselves. There is a good deal shown in Turkey, as well as in Tunis, that would have attracted great admiration had there been no Japan and no China to provoke unfavourable comparison. The famous Turkey carpets can scarcely be said to be satisfactorily represented. The very best, beautiful as the texture is, fall far short even in that respect of the Persian; while the contrasts displayed in the body of the Turkish patterns are too often disagreeably violent. But for the most part the carpets exhibited are of a very ordinary class indeed. The inlaid marqueterie and cabinet-work seems rude in design and coarse in execution if we measure it against the Japanese standards. The carved olive-wood from Jerusalem recalls the pedlars' hawking goods made for sale at the doors of the Holy Sepulchre. Here and there are some exquisite arms among many that are inferior; but even the very best of them are excelled by the Persians. There are graceful shapes in the pottery, but they are not unfrequently marred by defects in the workmanship. There is a great collection of figures in the various national costumes, and the dresses strike one as being somewhat incongruous. On the whole, the only articles in which Turkey may be said to show to decided advantage are some extremely rich furniture stuffs, the choicest of which seem to have been already sold or removed, and the dyed morocco, which, in its vividness of colour, shames anything that can be shown by the West. It must be remembered, however, that the Turk gives almost as many months to the dyeing process as the European allows days. Taste apart, we may perhaps console ourselves for the inferiority which we must confess by repeating that facts like this deliberate process of dyeing furnish the key to much of the Oriental excellence. Time is of no value in the East, and patience and indefatigable perseverance have always been the willing handmaids of their arts and manufactures.

DIANE DE LYS.

THIS play, of which so much has been said, has been seen in London only enough to excite, rather than satisfy, curiosity. The first remark that we have to make upon it is to express our earnest hope that no manager will attempt or be permitted to produce an English version of that which is incapable of translation. Those who have seen *Frou Frou* on the English stage have seen enough of adaptation, or rather violation, of French plays. It is the duty of the Lord Chamberlain to draw the line somewhere, and he drew it, and for some time maintained it, between *Frou Frou* and *Diane de Lys*. It is not our business to examine into the nature or extent of the differences which exist in life and conversation between the two ladies who have been so admirably represented by Madlle. Desclée. The former part has been played by other French actresses in London, but the latter, although it has existed for twenty years, has only been performed within the last month. Both these plays may serve equally to show how wide is the gulf which separates English from French dramatic art. You may take scenes from either play and translate them literally into English, and thus produce grotesque effects where the authors intended to be serious and even solemn.

We will begin at the fifth act of *Diane de Lys*, which has a tragic ending, although many of the scenes are light and playful. The act opens in the studio of Paul, to whom enters Taupin with a carpet-bag, and afterwards Maximilian. Taupin recounts an adventure which has just happened to himself. "You know," he says to Paul, "Madame Taupin, and you know how often I have prayed to be delivered from her." "That," says Paul, "is true." Maximilian here interferes to inquire who is Madame Taupin, and is informed that she is the speaker's wife. He thanks Taupin, and adds, "C'était simplement pour m'intéresser aux personnages." Taupin replies that she is his wife, "une petite personne bien désagréable." His friend Paul confirms this statement. "Ceci posé," continues Taupin, "je reprends le cours de ma narration." Madame Taupin had lately become less unpleasant than usual, and her husband began to think that there must be some cause for her amiability. Two days ago he made this reflection as he mounted the stairs to his abode, when he heard a door open, and "deux bottes, deux bottes triomphantes, deux bottes d'aplomb, deux bottes de maître de

maison, résonnèrent sur le carré, puis un baiser glissa dans l'air." The voice of Madame Taupin is heard making an appointment for three o'clock next day, and the two boots begin to descend the stairs. Taupin discreetly hides himself, and sees "un homme de cinq pieds six pouces au moins, de trente-quatre à trente-cinq ans, décoré, militaire . . . un homme superbe." He was singing the very air that Taupin himself was singing five minutes before, and doubtless Taupin's wife had taught it to him. Taupin allows the military gentleman to depart quietly, and then goes upstairs, says not a word of what he has heard, kisses Madame Taupin, calls her his "Loulou," makes himself a glass of grog, and goes to bed. Paul interjects, "C'est plein d'intérêt!" Next morning Taupin packs his carpet-bag, and tells his wife that he is going to Rouen. "I wonder," he says, "that since the opening of the railway all guilty wives do not shudder when their husbands tell them they are going to Rouen." A husband who wishes to detect his wife tells her that he is going to Rouen. His wife goes with him to the station, kisses him, and asks when he will be back. He answers, "In a week." He travels as far as Maisons, gets out, and takes the train back to Paris, "et vous devinez le reste." His friend Paul, recalling him from general principles to the particular example, inquires for "cette pauvre Madame Taupin." He explains that he had calculated to take the return train, which would reach Paris at three o'clock, so as to have comfortable time to walk to his dwelling and catch the military gentleman with the "chanson" of yesterday upon his lips. But, unfortunately, he took a walk and missed the train, and thus found no proof when he returned home. However, as he had prepared a scene, he chose to have it out. His wife defied him, told him that if he did not like her he should not have married her, reminded him that the premises and all upon them belonged to her, and turned him out of doors. "So," says he, "here I am, without a home, but also happily without a wife." Maximilian in turn tells his story. He fell in love with a dancer by whom he was half ruined, and for whose sake he was wounded in a duel. Taupin consoles him by remarking that the dancer might have ruined him altogether, and his rival might have killed him.

But it is now time to return to the hero of the play, Paul. His friend Maximilian asks him when he will be married. He puts off the answer, as he is still thinking of Diane de Lys and of the oath he has sworn to be revenged on her husband. Maximilian had given his friend prudent advice which he repeats. He should settle down to his work, return to his mother and his friends, forget a love which could not last, and above all thank Heaven that the whole of his life was not encumbered by a woman. As regards the Countess, he had nothing for which to blame himself. If they were separated, it was the fault of events, of circumstances, of the exigencies of society. But Paul would not listen to his friend. He persisted in following the Count, who travelled onward, keeping vigilant guard over his wife, but taking apparently not the slightest notice of the attendant Paul. At last that happened which might have been foreseen. The best pedestrian, even when he is in love, cannot keep up for ever with a postchaise. Paul's money was spent, and he was obliged to return to Paris, paint pictures, and sell them at half-price to replenish his purse. Now, continues the sage Maximilian, there are men whom such a prank would have ruined, but it did Paul good rather than harm. The story just spread far enough to reach the ears of an elderly widow lady, "très-spirituelle," who desired that the hero of it might be presented to her. The widow lady had a daughter, who, instead of seeing the ridiculous side of Paul's adventure, only saw the romantic side of it. The young lady falls in love with Paul. She has a million by way of fortune, she is charming as an angel, and she declares that she will never marry any one except Paul. Her mamma approves. Paul visits at the house, and pays attentions, and when the moment comes for decision he hesitates, and rejects that occasion "qui se présente une fois dans la vie de l'homme, de faire son bonheur et d'assurer sa fortune." We must allow that Maximilian is not alone among mankind in enunciating principles which are superior to the practice which he confesses.

Nobody can help seeing and admiring the skill with which this fifth act is framed to bring about the catastrophe. The defect of it to English eyes and ears is that Paul and Diane fail to interest English minds in troubles which originate in disregard of the ordinary principle of morality. That which is done in France is done in England, but it is talked about, and we might almost say thought about, in a different way. But we can at least emphatically approve Taupin's reinforcement of the argument of Maximilian:—"Une famille, cinquante mille livres de rente, vous pourriez faire de l'art avec des pinces d'or. . . . Mariez-vous, mon cher, mariez-vous." Paul cannot listen to these discreet friends. Diane has promised to write to him, and he will continue to believe in her fidelity, at least until she bids him cease to think of her. Maximilian answers, "Eh! mon cher, en amour il n'y a d'adieu éternel que celui qu'on ne dit pas." We do not care much for the sentiments of this play, but its maxims of worldly wisdom are beautiful. The same writer adds, with almost equal truth, that a woman who loves can always contrive to write. He begins to reproach Paul for allowing his proposed marriage with the romantic young lady of fortune to be talked about, but immediately he perceives Paul's true motive, which was that the report should reach the ears of Diane, and bring her back to him—"C'est ce que nous appelons du galvanisme d'amour." However, he lectures Paul severely for trifling with a girl who loves him, and for the sake of a woman who does not.

The Countess, he says, has changed her mind, and now loves the only person for loving whom Paul could not forgive her, to wit, her husband. Diane is a woman of originality. After being shut up for some time, she grew tired of tears, and merely for variety took to contemplating her gaoler-husband. To her surprise she found that he was "spirituel, élégant, beau garçon." She said to herself that she had been looking far for that which was close at hand, "et la voilà qui aime le compte." In proof of this statement he produces a genuine letter of Diane, in which she declares that peace is restored to her life, which she gives wholly to her husband. Paul believes, or seems to believe, this story, and declares his intention to go in for the heiress. "Come then," says Maximilian, "one has a deal of trouble to make you happy." Paul desires to be left alone that he may write to his mother. The experienced student of French plays is aware that the hero's mother always turns up in his thoughts when they become serious. But the real purpose of the friends' exit is that Paul may deliver a soliloquy. He turns out his drawers which contain letters of Diane and of Berthe, and perhaps of other ladies who are not specified. He is in a moral and self-judging mood of mind. Berthe loved him, and he made her suffer. He loved Diane, and she made him suffer. He will keep "un pieux souvenir" of Berthe, but of that other woman he will keep nothing. He tears up Diane's letters, and being partially tranquillized by this exercise, he proceeds to write to his mother. We shall best appreciate the difference between the French and English stage by conceiving an English actor reading aloud as he commits to paper a letter to his mother. It might be the fault of the actor or the audience, or both, but the inevitable result would be to throw ridicule on what is meant to be a solemn scene. "There is but one love which never deceives, and that is a mother's love." This sentiment, however beautiful, is, we think, out of place at the beginning of a letter which ends by announcing that the writer is going to be married. But small criticism should be hushed in presence of the actual catastrophe of the play. Diane enters softly, stands beside him, and calls him by his name. He receives her coldly and addresses her as Countess. She, with a just estimate of her lover's character, suggests that there is a woman on the premises. He assures her that they are alone, and copious explanation follows. Each disbelieves the explanation which the other gives. She becomes excited, and protests that her assurance of fidelity is that of a woman "qui n'a jamais menti à sa parole." Of course she forgets that a trifling exception to this statement exists as regards her marriage vow. He repeats his protestation, and adds, "Je vous le jure sur ma mère." We cannot help thinking that his mother has no call to appear in this conversation. However, each explains to the final satisfaction of the other. The lady's morality slightly confuses our ideas. Her father was dying, and it would have been wicked to quit his bedside, but it is apparently not wicked to quit her husband's house. She has made up her mind to go to Paul's mother, who after all has more to do with the affair than we had supposed. The mother will sympathize with one who loves her son. The two women will live together, and Paul will visit them. Thus they will lead quiet and happy lives—the world forgetting, by the world forgot. Unfortunately for this dream of bliss the door rattles, and the Count is heard forcing entrance. Paul demands, rather selfishly, as we think, a pledge from Diane that she will devote herself if he lives to his love, and if he dies to his memory; then he takes a last kiss, and exclaims, "Que la volonté de Dieu s'accomplisse!" He takes a pair of swords and advances towards the Count, expecting a fair duel. But the Count, having no chivalric nonsense in his head, shoots Paul while he has the chance. Paul exclaims, "Ma mère!" and falls dead. The friends enter at this moment and pose themselves while the Count explains that Paul was the lover of his wife, that he has done himself justice, and has killed Paul. It is only necessary to add that the best acting is needed to make this scene tolerable, even in French. The closest English translation is the most effectual burlesque of it. The part of Diane was performed by Madlle. Desclée "for the last time" on Saturday. We understand this to mean that arrangements had been made for the appearance of M. Brasseur in the present week; but there are likely to be other opportunities of seeing Madlle. Desclée as Diane, and perhaps as Frou Frou. But it is wise in a manager to give the public too little rather than too much of a good thing. English managers are too apt to do every play to death, and even to undesired resurrection.

THE GRAND PRIX AND ASCOT.

DONCASTER has met with the same fate at Paris which befel a far greater Derby winner, Blair Athol. The latter crossed the Channel to be beaten by Vermont, and a son of Vermont has this year trod in his sire's footsteps. There is no doubt that some horses stand the sea passage badly, and have not sufficient time after their journey to get round again. Moreover, the course at Longchamps is not one of the best in the world, and the turf is very different from that to which English horses are accustomed on their training grounds. Yet our horses have been successful on four occasions at Paris, and two Derby winners have added the Grand Prix to their Epsom triumph. The race, however, has never carried out its founder's idea of bringing together the best horses of both countries; and with Epsom just before it, and Ascot immediately following it, there is no wonder that English owners should be as a rule averse from exposing their representatives to the risks of such a tedious and fatiguing journey. There

was but a small field of seven last Sunday, to which we contributed two only, Doncaster and Chandos. Boiard, the winner of the French Derby, and Apollon, his stable companion, Flageolet, Franc-Tireur, and Louvigny made up the number. Mr. Merry had Marie Stuart engaged as well as Doncaster, but evidently thought that he had the race at his mercy with the Derby winner. According to the Two Thousand and Derby running he was quite justified in his opinion, for Boiard was a long way behind Kaiser and Gang Forward at Newmarket, and we all know how easily Doncaster defeated the latter pair at Epsom only a fortnight ago. No race, however, has been so fruitful in surprises, considering that it has only been established ten years, as the Grand Prix; and the easy defeat of Doncaster last Sunday is a repetition of the astonishing ill luck that in former years befell such horses as Lord Clifden and Blair Athol. No excuse can be made for Mr. Merry's horse on the score of condition, for we understand that he looked remarkably well, and showed no traces of having suffered from his long journey. Nor did he meet with any disappointment during the race. Apollon, as in the French Derby, made the running at a great pace, and when his mission was accomplished Boiard, Doncaster, and Flageolet were found lying well together. On the retirement of his stable companion Boiard assumed the lead, and for the last half-mile it was a real struggle which of the three could stay the longest. Doncaster tried vainly to wrest the lead from Boiard, but was never able to get fairly up to him, and the French Derby winner held his own to the end, and won by superior staying power, the victory being accomplished by a clear length. Flageolet finished with a rush, and just secured the second money, while Doncaster had to put up with the third place. Mr. Merry's horse was clearly beaten on his merits, for a more fairly ridden race could not be seen, and the winner honestly proved himself the better horse of the two. Boiard, it will be remembered, finished before Doncaster in the Two Thousand, but then the Derby showed that Doncaster had improved 21 lbs. since the Newmarket meeting, and now the Grand Prix shows that Boiard has improved still more. Flageolet, too, who so utterly disgraced himself in the Two Thousand, must have made astonishing improvement to beat the conqueror of Kaiser and Gang Forward over a mile and three-quarters course; and, altogether, the three-year-old running is more hopelessly complicated than ever. We cannot, however, jump to the conclusion that the English Derby was a mere chance victory, and that if Mr. Savile had sent Kaiser to Paris he would have secured the Grand Prix; but we regret that Mr. Merry did not send Marie Stuart to Paris, and keep Doncaster for the Prince of Wales's Stakes at Ascot. He would have had to give 4 lbs. to Kaiser and Gang Forward, which, according to the Epsom running, he could well have done, and the question whether the Derby was a true-run race or not could have been settled at once and for all. Now the answer is indefinitely postponed, for it is not impossible that Marie Stuart will represent Mr. Merry in the St. Leger instead of Doncaster. We may add, that all we have heard of the running in the French Derby and the Grand Prix confirms us in our opinion that, had Apollon started in the English Derby, he would have proved a formidable antagonist to the winner.

The first day at Ascot was as usual rich in good racing. Large fields contested the first two events, the Trial Stakes, and the Maiden Plate for two-year-olds. The uncertain Moorlands was successful in the first, and a very promising son of that rising sire Saccharometer, Sugarcane, won the second. Sweet Note, who was only beaten a head, is also by Saccharometer. A poor field of nine came to the post for the rich Prince of Wales's Stakes, which would have been a tame affair indeed had not those gallant opponents Kaiser and Gang Forward met, for the third time this season, to struggle for supremacy. It was fortunate that each had to carry the same penalty, thus raising their weight to 9 st. 1 lb., for they have proved themselves so inseparable that any advantage in the weights on one side or the other would quite spoil the interest of their encounters. Their seven opponents were of little account, even the allowances which most of them received not enabling them to cope with the first and second in the Two Thousand. Mr. Merry's representative, indeed, Highland Laddie, to whom Kaiser and Gang Forward had to give 12 lbs., attracted considerable attention, especially as it was rumoured that he was not such a very long way behind Doncaster. His performance by no means confirmed this flattering report; though a powerful colt, he shows but little quality, and his action is high, and not suited to a severe course. The remaining starters were Suleiman, The Preacher, Marquis Townshend, Miss Buckland, and Combat, from M. Lefevre's stable, and Capuchin—a poor stamp of competitors for one of the greatest races of the year. It is sufficient to say that The Preacher showed considerable speed for a mile; that Highland Laddie's fighting action exhausted his strength before he reached the straight, and that from the distance the race resolved itself into a match between Kaiser and Gang Forward. Between them there was as punishing and determined a struggle as in the Two Thousand and Derby, and this time Kaiser just got the best of it, and beat his old opponent by a head. Each has now beaten the other by a head, and once the judge has been unable to separate them. Each has deservedly won one of the great prizes of the year, and in the greatest of all neither would take advantage of the other. We cannot call to mind another instance of two good horses maintaining their relative form with such exactitude in race after race. It is true that neither of the pair is a first-class horse; but first-class horses might envy the gameness, the resolution, the

perseverance with which either fights out a battle to the best of his powers. There was a general opinion that Gang Forward was the better stayer of the two, and that he would be better served by the long ascent at the end of the race; but, on the contrary, he was more exhausted than his opponent towards the finish, and the long tiring hill troubled him more than Kaiser. Not from want of heart, but from sheer distress, Gang Forward swerved in the last hundred yards, while Kaiser ran on to the end with unflinching gameness. Horses cannot go on running such desperately close races, time after time, as if they were machines, and it would not be surprising if, at the next meeting of the pair, one of them were to play the coward. At present, however, they cannot be separated by the acutest handicapper; and whatever their relative reputation may be, as compared with the heroes of former years, there is no doubt that truer and more trusty horses never galloped on a race-course. Mr. Savile followed up his well-won victory in the Prince of Wales's Stakes by carrying off the Ascot Stakes, the principal handicap race of the meeting, and once the most important handicap race in England. Only nine runners contested it on this occasion; and Shannon, Vanderdecken, Falkland, Houghton, and Uhlán were the best of the nine. Shannon, however, is not the Shannon of 1871, or with her lenient weight she would have carried off this race in a canter. Vanderdecken is a vastly over-rated horse, and was fairly beaten by such a plater as Houghton; while Uhlán squandered his field in the last half-mile, and won in a walk. This race is now one of minor importance, though, like the Goodwood Stakes, its name has survived its reputation. The Queen's Stand Plate, once the T.Y.C., was a mere gift to Prince Charlie, as any other race, over the same distance, against any possible competitors, at weight for age, would be. Blenheim is a speedy horse, and Fordham rode him, but he could not make Prince Charlie gallop; and the two-year-olds, who have all the best of the weights at this race, and usually manage to secure it, could never get within sight of his tail. A select but good field started for the Gold Vase, Hannah, Struan, Cecilia, Thorn, Dutch Skater, and Lilian being among the runners. The wretched form of the three-year-old fillies was illustrated by the inability of Cecilia, the winner of the One Thousand Guineas, to get anywhere near the front; and the finish of the race was left to Hannah and Thorn, the latter, in the second division of the second-class three-year-olds, beating Baron Rothschild's mare by a neck. As far as quality went—estimating quality by the importance of the prizes won by the different competitors—this was the best field of the day, for it included a winner of the Oaks and St. Leger, two winners of the One Thousand Guineas, a winner of the Great Metropolitan, and of innumerable Queen's Plates, and such useful animals as Struan and Lilian. The victory of Thorn somewhat improves the form of this year's three-year-olds; yet he had some difficulty in shaking off Hannah, and Hannah, though a good mare, was neither an Achievement nor a Sunshine. The Biennial, for two-year-olds, was carried off by Lemnos, a son of Thunderbolt and Laura, who showed good form, inasmuch as among the beaten horses were Archduke and Birbeck, and the highly reputed Couronne de Fer had to put up with an indifferent third place.

On Wednesday Kaiser and Gang Forward had each a nice little exercise canter, and being relieved from the necessity of breaking one another's hearts, each won his little race—the value of each, by the way, was substantial—just as he pleased. Kaiser had only His Grace, King George, and John to beat, and won his six hundred sovereigns without having to go out of an easy gallop. Gang Forward's work was more difficult, for he had to give weight to Highland Laddie and Andre, but he was equal to the task, and won his race just as easily as Kaiser. Marie Stuart gave 7 lbs. to Wild Myrtle and Silver King in the Coronation Stakes, and beat them in such fashion as to show what an absolute certainty the Oaks was for her. The Triennial, for two-year-olds, fell to Sugarcane, who beat his five opponents as readily as on the preceding day; and the Royal Hunt Cup was won by Winslow, who carried the top weight, from twenty-six opponents, by a splendid effort of horsemanship on the part of Fordham. Speed was well represented in this race, Laburnum, Helmet, Oxford Mixture, Alava, The Pearl, Soucar, and the highly-priced Lord Gough being among the runners. Winslow showed fair form as a two-year-old, and might have taken his own part in the Derby last year had he not met with an accident a day or two before the race which incapacitated him from starting. His victory on Wednesday was mainly due to his rider, for a hundred yards from home he looked quite out of the race, and Reine had such a clear lead that her defeat seemed impossible. Fordham brought up Winslow just at the last moment and won on the post—his knowledge of how to win on the post being one of the characteristics of his riding which we often have occasion to notice at Newmarket.

The Gold Cup dwindled down at last to very poor dimensions. The entry was not good to begin with. None of the crack three-year-olds were in it, Thorn and Flageolet being the best. A good race seemed probable between Cremorne and Favonius, but the scratching of Baron Rothschild's horse dashed those hopes to the ground. Soon after his withdrawal Wenlock also was struck out; and the race became on paper what it turned out to be on the day—a gift to Cremorne. Flageolet, who, like other French horses, seems not to mind travelling backwards and forwards between France and England in the least, appeared none the worse for his race last Sunday; but he could not fairly extend Cremorne, who was in perfect condition, and, in addition, was bound, on his merits, to beat any three-year-old at weight for age. It is known

that he is better than Kaiser at weight for age; and Kaiser is very nearly at the head of the three-year-olds. The failure of the Cup race is much to be regretted, for there are few contests of that class now remaining in England, and at Ascot hitherto their prestige has been tolerably maintained. A race between Cremorne and Favonius would indeed have been worth witnessing; but directly the pen was put through the name of Baron Rothschild's champion, it was certain that the Ascot Cup this year would practically be walked over for by Cremorne.

REVIEWS.

LIFE OF GEORGE GROTE.*

MRS. GROTE'S book is an excellent specimen of one of the two admissible kinds of biography. A perfect Life can only be written by a friend who is in a sufficiently independent position to criticize as well as to appreciate the subject of his narrative. Near relatives and wives are, as a general rule, disqualified both by their own natural feelings and by a sense of propriety from the task of depicting the characters of eminent men; but the next best likeness to a portrait taken by an artist is a photograph, or unconscious revelation of moral and intellectual features. Mrs. Grote's work is almost an autobiography of her husband; and probably he could not have himself composed it with equal fidelity and force. If he had ever thought of writing his own life, his narrative would have been a mere record of thoughts, of studies, and of literary and political designs. To the lifelong companion of his career he was a politician, a scholar, and a historian; but he was before and above all things himself. The sustained and admiring sympathy which is now and then varied by kindly impatience in the notice of trifling foibles, enables Mrs. Grote to tell her story like an autobiographer from within. When she first announced her intention, Mr. Grote declared that of his life there was absolutely nothing to tell; but he admitted the truth of the reply that his life would be the history of his mind. Even his original protest was not wholly well founded. Fifty or sixty years of earnest toil, of growing fame, and of uninterrupted prosperity, are not within the range of ordinary experience. His resolute persistence in severe study down to the end of his life, from the time when he was transferred from school to his father's banking-house, belongs perhaps to the history of his mind. The bank had been established by his grandfather, Andreas Grote, an emigrant from Holland, and the historian of Greece pleased himself with the fancy that he might perhaps be connected by blood with the famous Hugo Grotius. At the Charterhouse, where he received his only regular education, Grote was a schoolfellow of Bishop Thirlwall, of Havelock, and of the two Waddingtons, one afterwards Under-Secretary of State, the other Dean of Durham. Few events in literary history better deserve to be recorded than the generous enthusiasm with which the Bishop of St. David's welcomed the publication of a History of Greece which was in his judgment destined to supersede his own. Almost the only disturbance of the smooth course of his prosperous career was caused by the harshness of his father in delaying his marriage, and in enforcing strict attendance at the bank. His mother's narrow religious fanaticism probably accounted for his extreme and lasting antipathy to theological belief. Mr. Grote's temperament might, in different circumstances, have inclined him to the adoption of some austere religious creed. If he had been a contemporary of Milton, instead of being a disciple of Bentham and of the elder Mill, he would probably have been a leader among the Presbyterians or the Independents. One proof that his Republicanism was of the ancient and orthodox kind was furnished by his inclination to the cause of the South during the American Civil War. Constitutional rights asserted with heroic pertinacity were to him more sacred than philanthropic sentiments, and even than democratic commonplaces. In his personal character Mr. Grote resembled the type of the English Commonwealth rather than that of modern democracy. A Radical and a Republican, he maintained the stately bearing which might have become the friends of Hampden and Sidney. In his later years he was remarkable for a formal and gracious courtesy of demeanour, which accorded well with a handsome and dignified presence. Mrs. Grote is fully justified in applying to him the familiar passage in which Chaucer sums up the character of his perfect knight. It may readily be believed that in all his life Mr. Grote never treated a human being with contumely or arrogance. It may be collected from the letters which are published, and from the whole tenor of the biography, that, while he was simple and gentle, he was uniformly serious. His acuteness of intellect may perhaps have enabled him to understand humour and irony; but probably from youth to age he never uttered a joke. The only taste which he possessed which was not strictly intellectual seems to have been a wholesome love of horses. When he was at one time staying with Mrs. Grote in the neighbourhood of a trainer's establishment, they were in the habit of getting up early to see Blink Bonny and her stable companions taking their gallops. He also liked whist, which occupies an intermediate place between intellectual labour and recreation; but it was his greatest pleasure, when he was not reading or writing, to discuss classical and historical questions with Sir George Lewis, or metaphysics and political economy with Mr. Mill or Dr. Bain.

* *The Personal Life of George Grote.* By Mrs. Grote. London: John Murray, 1873.

Mrs. Grote, with sound judgment, shared the main current of his life in her unflinching attention to the progress of his great historical work.

In her own words, "Mrs. G. Grote was habitually studious, after her fashion, under the direction of her husband, who laid great stress upon her cultivating the ratiocinative vein of instruction, above all logic, metaphysics, and politics; and she accordingly strove to master these subjects, out of deference to his wish, and in order to qualify herself to be associated with his intellectual tastes and labours, as time wore on." Neither teacher nor pupil probably appreciated the great superiority of the gifts which are displayed in the present biography to any direct result of "the ratiocinative vein of instruction." The motive and the practical result of the lady's studies mattered more than her attainments in metaphysics. It was at her suggestion that Mr. Grote designed and commenced the *History of Greece*, about the year 1823. The progress of the work was afterwards interrupted by his entrance into political life, as member for the City of London in the first Reformed Parliament. He had previously become a principal leader in the small party then called the Philosophical Radicals, including Sir W. Molesworth, Mr. Roebuck, and Mr. Charles Buller. Mr. Grote took an active part in all the proceedings of the extreme Liberal party, and he introduced in several Sessions Bills for the establishment of vote by Ballot; but the country was with a sound instinct averse to further organic changes; and the progress of natural reaction reduced the handful of ultra-reformers to a powerless condition. It was without regret on his own part, and perhaps without loss to the country, that Mr. Grote retired from Parliament in 1841, to devote the rest of his life to the composition of his History and of his treatises on Greek philosophy. Thirty years later, when his early opinions were adopted by Mr. Gladstone's Government, the enthusiasm of Mr. Grote for the Ballot had sensibly cooled. "I confess," he said to Mrs. Grote, "that, since the wide expansion of the voting element, the value of the Ballot has sunk in my estimation." It may be remembered that at the same time the Minister, at a loss for a reason to justify his conversion, announced that his former preference for open voting had been removed "since the wide expansion of the voting element." The practical politician had reasons for conforming to the creed of the majority, while the veteran supporter of the Ballot had become less sanguine with advancing years. Prejudices, as well as political convictions, relaxed under the genial influence of time. Mrs. Grote naturally regretted the determination of her "somewhat intolerant partner," during the early years of their married life, to exclude himself and her from the aristocratic society to which she was attracted by taste and connexion. It seems strange that fifty years ago a refined scholar, possessed of an easy fortune, should have regarded the classes with which he might most suitably have associated with the dislike which Madame Roland and her friends entertained towards French princes and nobles in the days of the Revolution. In this respect Mr. Grote had been biased by the precepts and example of Mr. James Mill, who cultivated the bitterest hatred against the classes which then governed England. No impartial observer of competent capacity and with suitable opportunities can doubt that the art of society attains its highest perfection among those who have time and inclination to make it their study, and means to adorn it with luxury and taste. When Mr. and Mrs. Grote visited Lord Lansdowne at Bowood in 1857, "the magnificence, order, elegant entertainment, and withal liberty of individual occupation which reigns in that establishment, struck both Mr. Grote and myself much." Two years before his death, Mr. Grote declined the offer of a peerage, which could not have been more suitably bestowed. In his letter to Mr. Gladstone he explained that "the honourable status and title" would at his age and "to his peculiar feelings be an unwelcome change"; but his main reason for refusing the honour was his unwillingness to undertake new and weighty duties, to which Mr. Gladstone had courteously referred. It is pleasant to find that, instead of despising the bauble which would formerly have roused his Republican indignation, "the incident was naturally productive of agreeable feelings, both to himself and to his intimate friends, and I will confess that it not seldom formed the subject of our quiet domestic talk." Although a seat in the House of Lords involves no necessary share in political or legislative business, it was not consistent with Mr. Grote's principles or habits to convert any office or dignity into a sinecure. To the last he was actively employed as a trustee of the British Museum, a member of the Council of University College, and Vice-Chancellor of the University of London.

Mrs. Grote wisely leaves to professed scholars the duty of estimating the value of her husband's contributions to literature and to history. Her function is to record the untiring labours which after the close of the short Parliamentary episode occupied the remainder of his life. Although he was deficient in grace and felicity of style, his History of Greece is not likely to be superseded. He has probably exhausted the limited stock of materials which can scarcely hereafter be enlarged; and future rivals will only be able to controvert some of his practical and political conclusions. Since the time of Mitford, the history of ancient Greece has been written with more or less of party spirit; and even the serene intellect of Thirlwall has not been unaffected by political prepossessions. Mr. Grote's admiration for the Athenian practice of secret voting, and his celebrated apology for Cleon, are not the result of purely dispassionate investigation; but a controversial interest in the events and persons of the distant past, if it some-

times interferes with perfect impartiality, affords the best security against vagueness and unreality. Mr. Grote's Athenian statesmen and orators are living men whom he might have met in society or in the English Parliament, and not conventional shadows of the type which in the eighteenth century was indicated under the title of "the Ancients." Mr. Grote's merit as an historian who had also been a man of business engaged in public life was appreciated in the native land of profound book-learning. The ex-Prussian Minister Schön remarked, in a letter to Varnhagen von Ense, on the false portraits which mere scholars have depicted for want of knowledge of the world. How greatly the death of Leonidas has been overrated; and, on the other hand, the scholars (*Philologen*) have not nearly done justice to Pericles. He is now to me the first of the Greeks. Lobeck, now the patriarch of scholarship at Königsberg, takes his hat off to Grote, and his colleague Lehrs bends his knee. I should like to know what Boeckh, Meineke, &c., say of the work of the London banker.

Although none but a politician can understand ancient or modern political life, Mr. Grote's industry and his absorption in his subject were rather German than English. His correspondence with Sir G. Lewis turned in great measure on questions of ancient history and philology; and, if he had left no fuller record of his studies, some of the letters would sufficiently prove the ripeness and soundness of his scholarship. An argument against a version in which Lewis and Waddington had concurred, of a phrase put by Thucydides into the mouth of Pericles, is an excellent example of the application to a verbal discussion of general considerations deduced from the character of the speaker and the audience. Sir G. Lewis was probably convinced by Mr. Grote's arguments that the boast of "cultivating the fine arts without needless expense" would neither have been pronounced by Pericles nor relished by his hearers:—

The ornamental outlay at Athens had been prodigiously great, and was also quite recent. Moreover it had been intentionally great, in order that the "visible splendour" of the city might become imposing. . . . The Athenians would think it the reverse of a compliment to be told that they had got the result at small cost. A marble statue of Athens might be as fine, artistically speaking, as one of ivory and gold. Nevertheless they thought the latter material more suitable, because it was more costly.

Mr. Grote's somewhat reconde interpretation of the passage recalls the contrast in Horace:—

Privatus illis census erat brevis;
Commune magnum.

The composition of the History furnished the writer for many years with congenial occupation; and the reception of the work from its commencement must have afforded him unqualified pleasure. It was not the smallest element of his happiness that his present biographer evinced the keenest interest in the History by minute criticism of every part as it was written. The chief drawback to a literary life is the intellectual solitude which is rather mitigated than relieved by mere domestic companionship. "Our History," as Mrs. Grote sometimes calls it, must have been far more interesting to the author than if he had been sole owner of the property which he had created. Mrs. Grote called a cottage which they had built at East Burnham out of the profits of the book, History Hut, and it was there that, at the end of 1855, the History was finally completed. On a corresponding occasion Gibbon paced his terrace looking over the Lake of Geneva. Mrs. Grote, not less appropriately, "had a little bowl of punch brewed at Christmas for our little household at History Hut, Grote himself sipping the delicious mixture with great satisfaction, while manifesting little emotion outwardly, though I could detect unmistakable signs of inward complacency, as I descanted upon the happiness of our living to see this day, and so forth." The void which might have been created by the loss of customary occupation was amply filled by the composition of the elaborate treatises on Plato and Aristotle. Fortunate in nearly all the circumstances of his life, Mr. Grote had measured for himself a task which nearly coincided with the time which remained at his disposal. He enjoyed with philosophic moderation the well-earned fame of his later years, taking especial pleasure in the respect and admiration of the younger race of students during a visit which he paid to the present Dean of Westminster, who then resided at Oxford, as Professor and Canon of Christchurch. He died after a short illness on the 18th of June, 1871, at the age of seventy-six, and he was buried in Westminster Abbey. Mrs. Grote has fully answered the doubt which he expressed whether there was anything in his life worth telling.

TODHUNTER'S CONFLICT OF STUDIES.*

THIS volume of essays is a very opportune contribution to the right understanding of some questions about which there has lately been a marked increase of general interest, and which are not likely to be left much longer without some attempt to deal with them on an extensive scale. Much as University education has been discussed, there is still much wanting to complete a satisfactory exchange of ideas (if we may so apply the convenient phrase of modern diplomatic cant) between the Universities and the public. The Universities have some difficulty in discovering what sort of provision for the higher education of English youth is desired, and the public, even when they know what they wish for, have apparently no very clear notion of what actually exists. We have here the statements and opinions of an eminent Cambridge

teacher on various important points of the Cambridge system which are peculiarly within his own knowledge, and on which the judgment of an enlightened expert will be especially valuable for the purposes of any proposed new schemes. We do not know, indeed, that Mr. Todhunter's essays will be acceptable to the school of University reformers who want to reconstruct everything from the outside. For he proceeds throughout on the assumption that a man who has spent several of the best years of his life in administering an elaborate system may reasonably be expected to understand its strong and its weak points better than one who knows it only by report, or who has passed through its discipline but ceased to be familiar with it. And this assumption will no doubt appear unwarrantable to those who believe that re-organizing a University comes by nature, and that nothing stands in the way of its being done to-morrow but the prejudices and obstinacy of the existing authorities. Mr. Todhunter also speaks in a somewhat reserved, not to say sceptical, tone, of the results to be looked for from sundry untried experiments which are propounded by their advocates with an air of infallibility. Such advocates will regard Mr. Todhunter's guarded counsels as only an additional proof of the hopeless insensibility of the Cambridge mind to all new impulses. Again, those who wish to turn the Universities into large shops for selling useful knowledge at the lowest possible remunerative price will certainly find nothing whatever to their liking in these pages, as indeed we should be very sorry if they did.

The object of our Universities is not to be warehouses of information. What is aimed at is to give the best possible general training, and the best attainable means of cultivating special branches of knowledge, to those who will take advantage of them; and also, by whatever means [we can, to induce those who cannot or will not do this to go through processes which will give them at least a tolerable tincture of mental and social discipline. The first of these objects is already attained in a very high degree in some departments of learning. Mr. Todhunter's vindication of what is done in his own seems very sufficient. And we see no reason to doubt that results of the same quality may be produced in other studies which are comparatively in their infancy when they have fairly taken root, so as to be pursued with proportionate energy and method. As to the second object, it would be absurd to deny that the success is in many cases very partial; but the failures are in great measure due to causes not under the control of the Universities or Colleges. University teachers are exhorted to devote themselves to original research, higher scientific culture, and so forth, while in fact their lecture-rooms have to be school-rooms where they attempt to make men learn the rudiments which ought to have been learnt at school. And why are they not learnt at school? Speaking on behalf of the much-abused college don, we might leave the schoolmaster to account for it. But we suspect it is not so much the schoolmaster's fault as the parent's. So long as English parents send their boys to school without really caring much whether they work or not, which undoubtedly is often the case, so long will many English boys take no particular trouble to learn anything at school, and go up scandalously unprepared to college. Thus the college has not a fair start, and the whole standard of University work is kept down far below what it ought to be, and what the Universities and Colleges would be only too glad to make it if the public would let them. If the parents would help the schoolmaster more in the beginning, they would not so often have reason to complain of the end.

We have mentioned a high special education for which a very elaborate machinery has been developed, and a very moderate general education, as the two distinct provisions made at Cambridge for different kinds of students. What becomes of those who want a high general education, but not a high special education; who wish to acquire a cultivated and scientific habit of mind, but do not aim at being experts in the utmost refinements of mathematics or scholarship? This question hits the point which seems to us the weakest in the Cambridge system. The present state of things as to mathematics is excellently described by Mr. Todhunter. He says:—

Our aim seems to be not so much to afford an adequate discipline to all our students, as to lavish superfluous care upon a few, with the view of creating professional mathematicians. . . . There are two classes of students of very different characters who are to be tried by the same tests. There are six or eight men in every year who are competing for the highest places and for the fellowships to which such honours lead; and these for the most part have such an amount of mathematical power that very difficult papers may be submitted to them, without any extravagant disproportion, at least in quality, between what they are required to do and what they really accomplish. Then we have on the other hand a large number of students who have no particular taste for mathematics, whose attainments are gained only by patient and laborious application; for this class the papers set are on the whole far too difficult. It would seem that the examination by which we endeavour to discover who are the best possible candidates for high mathematical appointments, and the examination by which we ascertain if students of moderate ability have gone through a salutary course of discipline with steady attention, are altogether different in their objects, and can scarcely take with advantage a common form.

The same remarks apply, with very little change, to the classical examinations. It is disheartening to think of the time consumed in Greek and Latin verse composition by men who might derive much profit from being made sound scholars up to a certain point, but who will never be accomplished enough to find either profit or pleasure in these refined exercises. But it is safer for examination purposes to produce average translation and average verse

* *The Conflict of Studies, and other Essays on subjects connected with Education.* By L. Todhunter, M.A., F.R.S. London: Macmillan & Co. 1873.

composition than good translation and no verse composition. A paper of instructions used to be circulated at Eton warning beginners in Latin verse that "A few good verses are worth much; many good verses are worth more; but many bad verses are worth nothing." One result of the Cambridge Classical Tripos is a considerable crop of that which is worth nothing. And the recent additions of higher subjects to the examinations for both mathematical and classical honours all tend to aggravate this over-specialized character of the Triposes. Of course these subjects are important in themselves, and due provision should be made for their being learnt by those who really have time and aptitude for learning them. Especially as to Comparative Philology we must protest against a disparaging allusion of Mr. Todhunter's in his opening essay. We do not know whether it is a good subject for examinations, nor do we very much care; but certain it is that Comparative Philology has given us an instrument of research into the mental, and to no small extent the material, history of whole races of men whose power we are only beginning to know. In the study of language it makes all the difference between a mere registry of facts and an organized science, and the importance of its methods can fairly be compared to nothing less than that of a new calculus in mathematics. But it does not follow, as Mr. Todhunter elsewhere in the book justly observes, from the interest or importance of a novel subject, that the present universal remedy of putting it into an examination (or sometimes making a new one on purpose for it) is wisely applied. It is admitted that the present examinations are already too long. We venture to make a suggestion as worthy of attention, though not pledging ourselves to it, and admitting that it could not be adopted without entailing other changes, both in the University and in the College curriculum, which would have to be well considered. Might it not be a satisfactory way of attaining the desired end of a sufficient general discipline for all, and sufficient encouragement of special studies for the few, if the principle already adopted for ordinary degrees were to be extended to honour degrees? Let there be a general examination about a year earlier in the course than the Tripos now is, followed by optional special examinations. The Smith's Prizes and the Chancellor's Medals, which now have little or no independent significance, and only entail needless extra work on examiners and examined, might under such a scheme be utilized for the final special examinations in the higher branches of mathematics and scholarship respectively, and thus be restored to all their ancient dignity. Doubtless any one who made the suggestion at Cambridge would be vigorously opposed; amongst other things he would be accused of deserting the traditions of the place to copy the Oxford system of Moderations. For our own part, we do not see why the Universities should be above taking counsel from one another, and we think this matter one of those in which Cambridge has something to learn from Oxford. But we have unimpeachable Cambridge testimony on our side. The idea we have put forward is to be found in one of the earliest pages of Mr. Todhunter's book, though he does not pursue it to any consequences:—

The excessive cultivation for examination purposes of one department of knowledge to the exclusion of others seems to me one of the great evils of our modern system of bribing students by great prizes and rewards to go through our competitive struggles. We are in danger of giving up all pretence of a general course of training for youth, and of allowing and even encouraging boys to select some special subject which they fancy they prefer, or rather perhaps which they least dislike. I should desire quite a contrary system; a scheme of study and examination should be drawn up after due deliberation, and all candidates be required to pass through this before the avenues to special distinction were opened. In theory perhaps this is still attempted; but in practice we seem to deviate from such a course more and more every year at Cambridge. For instance, students of classics are no longer compelled, as they formerly were, to pass a mathematical examination for their degree; and for the most part undergraduates in the colleges are excused from attendance at lectures on the subjects which they do not profess to cultivate. Even where an attempt is made to prescribe some general course the standard in each department is fixed so low as not to ensure more than the simplest rudiments of knowledge.

The general reflections suggested by these essays leave us little room to comment on their details. There is a minor point about fellowships on which we must differ from the author. He disapproves of examining for fellowships as a superfluous addition to the University course, and seems to assume that candidates for fellowships generally continue to read with a private tutor after taking their degrees. Only two Colleges do examine for fellowships at Cambridge so far as we know; and in that with which we are best acquainted—which, however, is not Mr. Todhunter's—it is not the practice for candidates to go on receiving special instruction; on the contrary, they generally begin to take pupils on their own account while they are waiting for their fellowships. The examination is also no mere vain repetition of the Tripos, but acts in some ways as a corrective.

As to the introduction of natural and experimental science into the University course, which is strenuously, and by some even violently, demanded, Mr. Todhunter fears, as a scientific mathematician, that science without mathematics may possibly be made an excuse for evading any exact discipline of the mind altogether. We think his suspicion of the indiscriminate cry for useful knowledge is by no means ill founded.

Those who take an interest either way in the fate of the conspiracy to depose Euclid which is being carried on in this country will find an able apology for him in the essay on "Elementary Geometry." Here again the writer suspects that some of the professed reformers

want to substitute the mere imparting of facts for the training of the reason. But this controversy, as well as many other questions more or less debated in Mr. Todhunter's volume, we must leave to be settled by the ultimate verdict of the competent judges in such matters—if only the incompetent will allow them to settle it.

DOROTHY, COUNTESS OF SUNDERLAND.*

THE lovely and lively lady whom Waller's adoration in verse has made celebrated by the name of Sacharissa, the Lady Dorothy Sydney, was a daughter of Robert Earl of Leicester by Lady Dorothy Percy, daughter of the Earl of Northumberland. The famous Algernon Sydney was her brother. Her eldest brother, Lord Lisle, while her father lived, was an adherent of Cromwell, but a man of no political mark; as Earl of Leicester he survived the Revolution, and is the hero of one of Dryden's later adulatory dedications. Another brother, Robert Sydney, was, there is great reason to believe, the real father of the Duke of Monmouth, Charles II.'s putative son by Lucy Walters or Barlow. She had been first Algernon Sydney's mistress, then Robert Sydney's, and then Charles's. Yet another brother, the youngest—youngee by three-and-twenty years than Dorothy—was Henry Sydney, an agreeable courtier and a man of pleasure, who in a diplomatic mission to the Hague acquired the friendship of the Prince of Orange, and, being deeply engaged in the counsels which brought about the Revolution, enjoyed the great favour of William III., who conferred on him various high employments, and created him Earl of Romney.

At the age of two-and-twenty Lady Dorothy was married to Henry Lord Spencer of Wormleighton. Their married life, while it lasted, was singularly happy. Her husband, having been created Earl of Sunderland, was slain, in September 1643, at Newbury, where he fought as a volunteer for the King. After four years of happy married life the Countess was a widow with a son and two daughters. The son, Robert Earl of Sunderland, grew up, and became a politician, and has left a worse than doubtful reputation as a leading Minister of Charles II. and James II. The eldest daughter married another Minister of those two reigns, the accomplished and brilliant George Savile, Lord Halifax. It may be added that Lord Shaftesbury married for his third and last wife a sister of Lady Sunderland's husband; he was, therefore, uncle of Sunderland and of Lady Halifax, and he was already the uncle of Halifax by his first marriage with a daughter of Lord Keeper Coventry. It may be further added that Lady Russell, the wife of Lord Shaftesbury's good political ally, was first cousin of the first Earl of Sunderland, the husband of Sacharissa, and of the third wife of Lord Shaftesbury. Thus Shaftesbury, Russell, Halifax, and Sunderland, greatly divided in politics, were a family party. If Monmouth were the son of Robert Sydney, he would be a notable reinforcement of the family party.

The news of the Earl of Sunderland's death at Newbury in September 1643 had reached the Earl of Leicester at Oxford, where he was with King Charles I., and he despatched a messenger to Penshurst, where Lady Sunderland was with her mother, to break to them the dreadful news. Lord Leicester's letter on this occasion to his bereaved daughter has long since been published in Collins's Sydney State Papers, and is a model of kindness and wisdom; it came from one who was reputed very learned and judicious. Mr. Blencowe has published in the appendix to Henry Sydney's Diary and Correspondence the report sent to Lord Leicester by his messenger of the way in which the news was broken to Lady Leicester and her daughter. It was a letter worth publishing; he had disquieted Lady Sunderland, but not told her all; he went to Lady Leicester and told her the fact; she swooned in excess of grief, but, when she came to, the messenger urged her to be firm, and go to her daughter to disclose the whole truth and to console her:—

This I urged and pressed upon her as much as I could, till she had overcome her own passion, and then I waited on her to my Lady Sunderland's chamber, where, falling on her neck, she spoke such comfortable words to her, and in so affectionate a manner, as I am confident it was not possible for any divine or orator, with all their study and premeditation, to have been able in so short a time to have charmed so great a grief so well.

After nearly nine years of widowhood, Lady Sunderland was married, in July 1652, to a Kentish neighbour of her father's at Penshurst, Robert, eldest son of Sir John Smythe or Smith (as the name was variously spelt), and a relative of Viscount Strangford, who had married her sister, Lady Barbara Sydney. By this marriage she had a son, Robert Smythe, who was grandfather of Sir Sydney Stafford Smythe, Chief Baron of the Exchequer. Lady Sunderland survived her second husband, and died in 1684, the year in which her brother Algernon was executed.

There was no public proof of Lady Sunderland's talent and wit till the publication by Miss Berry, from the Duke of Devonshire's papers, of a small packet of her letters addressed in 1680 to her son-in-law Halifax. Since then some of her letters addressed to her brother Henry in 1679 and 1680 have been published by

* *Some Account of the Life of Rachael Wriothersley, Lady Russell.* By the Editor of Madame du Daffaud's Letters [Miss Berry], &c., &c. To which are added Eleven Letters from Dorothy Sydney, Countess of Sunderland, to George Savile, Marquis of Halifax, in the year 1680. Published from the Originals in the possession of His Grace the Duke of Devonshire. London. 1819.

Diary of the Times of Charles II. By the Hon. Henry Sydney (afterwards Earl of Romney), including his Correspondence with the Countess of Sunderland, &c., &c. Edited, with Notes, by R. W. Blencowe, Esq., A.M. 2 vols. London. 1843.

Mr. Blencowe. They are charmingly vivacious, pointed, and epigrammatic. They are full of political and personal gossip, and throw light on the political history of two important years of the reign of Charles II. Horace Walpole or Lady Mary Wortley Montagu did not write better letters. The Countess is in her sixty-second year in September 1679, when her extant correspondence begins. It ends in November 1680.

Old Waller, as she calls him, her poetical adorer in her youth, is now, in his seventy-fifth year, a frequent visitor in her drawing-room. Burnet says of him that at eighty he was the delight of the House of Commons. Her brother Algernon Sydney is often mentioned, never pleasantly. A lady friend, Lady Harvey, has told her that "she wonders nobody shoots him." There is a marriage in the family of a daughter of Lady Lucy Pelham, sister of the Countess and of Algernon, but Algernon will not go near his kinsfolk. "Mr. Algernon never goes to them, though they have sought him, so that I have wondered at it often." He is ill, and the Countess is respectfully civil to him:—"Our brother Algernon is very ill of a cough; he eats nothing but water-gruel; I do not see him, but I have sent to him twice." She is writing to their brother Henry, with whom Algernon is on bad terms. Her civil attention to Algernon brought him to see her, and she treats him as a wayward child:—"My brother Algernon, upon my sending to know how he did when he was ill, has come to me three times, and I believe will continue it, for he seems very well pleased with it. We have not said one word of any difference, and I never contradict him when he says such things as that Sir William Coventry is no more an able than a handsome man."

The martyr Algernon was privately morose, haughty, and quarrelsome. He had returned to England from a long political exile some two years before the Countess of Sunderland's correspondence begins, in time to see his wise and honoured father before the termination of his long life. He had endeavoured unsuccessfully to obtain a seat in the House of Commons for Guildford, at the general election of February 1679, and again for Amersham at the quickly following general election of September of the same year. He had done all he could, but without success, to thwart his brother Henry's election for Bramber, by supporting Sir Charles Wolseley, a Republican, against him. Algernon was for a Commonwealth. With this view, and hoping for support from France for a Republic in England if troubles came on the death of Charles, he gave himself up to the policy of the King of France, and worked hard among the English Republicans and sectaries to make opposition to the King's Administration and difficulties for the King. The Duke of Buckingham did the same. Algernon Sydney and Buckingham constantly frequented the French Ambassador, Barillon, received from him money presents, and were beggars for more. Ralph Montagu, the treacherous foe of Danby, was another of Barillon's paid emissaries; but Montagu was a zealous advocate of Monmouth's succession. Sydney and Montagu were nevertheless on friendly terms. Shaftesbury and Russell disliked Sydney. There is unfortunately no doubt, from Barillon's despatches, that the money given to Sydney was for his own use. This is by way of introduction to some of Lady Sunderland's chit-chat. She writes to Halifax, her son-in-law, July 8, 1680:—

This I believe is true; my Lord Shaftesbury's and Mr. Algernon's quarrel, who has heard Shaftesbury say he is a French pensioner, and my Lord Sunderland's spy; he pays him again. This is likely to go as high as tongues can. . . . My brother is suspected to be in with the Duke of Buckingham; to-day he is with Wildman; how far that is a sign of it I know not. Mr. Montagu is not in any affair with them, it is thought, for he does not appear amongst them, and talks of going to France next month.

On July 19 she writes about the Whig triumph in the election of Bethell and Cornish as Sheriffs:—

The news of yesterday every one in the street can send you, and better than I, my dear Lord; yet I must be scribbling. At the choosing of the sheriffs, which are the same again, a loud outcry, "No Yorkist! no Papist!" This by hundreds; and one proposed they beat, so that he is very ill, still crying, "A Yorkist, none of him!" My Lord Russell said he was sorry one of them was chosen, for he was as great a Commonwealth man as Algernon Sydney. I wonder what his Lordship is, if he is not so too, and goes so far towards it. . . . Mr. Algernon is busy, about what God knows. Last night he was called out of my chamber; I asked by whom, and my man said a Quaker. The Duke of Buckingham very lately pretended to have some trouble of conscience, and talked of it to some fanatics, and they said he appeared to be in a good mind, and they were to come to him again to finish the work. At a time appointed he could not be found; and afterwards they heard he was with a wench all that day.

Here is some lively gossip about Shaftesbury, the head of "the mutineers," as she calls his party:—

Yesterday my brother Smith [brother of her second husband] dined at my Lord Shaftesbury's, and thought him pettish and out of humour extremely. Mr. Hampden [grandson of the celebrated John Hampden; member of Parliament for Buckinghamshire] came in before dinner, and said, "My Lord, have we a league with the Dutch?" "Yes," says my Lord. Says Hampden, "This will be all turned against us; we shall have the Prince of Orange with an army here." They are so mad, they know not what they say. He whispered to my Lord Shaftesbury, and Smith heard him say, "I am afraid this will fool the Parliament." These are good Englishmen and Protestants! I am never better pleased than when I am told these things will be done, that my Lord Halifax will approve, for then I am sure that is good for the nation, and my son [Sunderland] being for these ways too is a satisfaction to me (June 20).

My brother Spencer* was in town yesterday; he had a mind to see his sister [Lady Shaftesbury], and sent to her to meet him at Southampton

* Robert Spencer, brother of Earl of Sunderland, her first husband, and brother of Lady Shaftesbury; made a Scotch peer, Viscount Teviot, by James II.

House [Lord Russell's residence]. He would not go to my Lord Shaftesbury's, because of his proceedings against the Duke. My Lord Russell asked him why he would conceal his. He might have told him, "You are but a blind follower." . . . My Lord Shaftesbury makes love to my Lady Orrery*; she is so well pleased with it, that she is absolutely of his party, and my Lady Betty Felton too† (July 8).

There is one place of council I should never have suspected, my Lady Orrery's, till I did know that my Lord Shaftesbury, Duke of Monmouth, and my Lord Cavendish do meet and sup there, and Mrs. Nelly [Nell Gwyn], who the King had forbid letting the Duke of Monmouth come to her house (July 27).

It was a critical day, November 15, 1680, when the Exclusion Bill was rejected in the House of Lords by a majority of 33 (63 to 30), chiefly under the influence of the persuasive eloquence of Halifax. Sunderland voted for the Bill, led by the Duchess of Portsmouth, who had taken up Monmouth, and the King deprived him of his Secretaryship of State. Old Lady Sunderland sided with her son-in-law, Halifax, whom she idolized, and regretted her son's vote. Two days after the vote of the House of Lords, the Commons voted by 219 to 95 an Address to the King, which was moved by Ralph Montagu, to remove Halifax from His Majesty's presence and councils for ever. Lady Sunderland in her lively manner supplies some very interesting particulars in writing to Henry Sydney, November 19:—

I am full of my Lord Halifax, and will tell what perhaps nobody else will—that a day or two before the Duke's Bill was carried to the Lords, one of the great actors came to him as a friend, I suppose, to tell him if he did speak against it he would be impeached by the House of Commons, or an Address made to remove him from his great place of Privy Councillor; he answered neither threatenings nor promises should hinder him from speaking his mind. How he did it, you who know may judge; on a point, he says, he has studied more than ever he did any, and would have been glad if he could have gone the popular and safe way. He had company enough with him, but my Lord of Shaftesbury and Mr. Montagu have singled him out of the herd of sixty-three that were of his mind, to desire to remove him from the King. . . . As he came out of the Lords' House, he was told that the House of Commons was on this debate, which was very long. He said he would go home to dinner. He did not speak with one man, because they should not say he was making friends, and so he did. In the afternoon his house was full of House of Commons' men. My son was there at one time—that is the thorn in my side, though in everything else they agree; but it cannot be as I would have it, so long as my son is well with Lord Shaftesbury. Halifax has desired the King to let him go; they will come much nearer to His Majesty's concerns than my Lord Halifax. My nephew Pelham† voted for him, Sir William Jones against him, but did not speak. In short, he says he will speak his mind, and not be hanged so long as there is law in England. I am not well; pardon this narrative. I were a beast if I were not concerned for so perfect and constant a good friend. You shall soon hear from me again. I love you with all my heart.—D. S.

In a letter written a few days after, November 25, Lady Sunderland corrects herself about Shaftesbury:—"My Lord Shaftesbury disowns having anything to do in it, and my Lord Russell. I heard 'twas Montagu and the two lawyers, Jones and Winnington, who show their profession."

We have given specimens enough to show the historical interest of these letters, and the lively and gushing character of the Countess's style. We should very gladly have more of her letters. Mr. Blencowe's two volumes, the contents of which came from the Earl of Chichester, lineal descendant of Thomas Pelham, Lady Sunderland's nephew, contain a much larger number of letters addressed to Henry Sydney by another Countess of Sunderland, wife of our Countess's son. These letters also are interesting for political gossip, but inferior in style to the mother-in-law's. This second Countess of Sunderland was a Digby, daughter of the Earl of Bristol, the brilliant political promise of whose youth had been destroyed by unstable character and great eccentricities. The lady's letters to Henry Sydney clearly show a sentiment of passion for her husband's handsome and susceptible uncle. There is a refulgent and voluptuous beauty in her portrait by Lely at Hampton Court. She had an intimate and pure friendship with Evelyn. But her character has been drawn in very dark colours in confidential letters of the Princess, afterwards Queen, Anne to Mary, Princess of Orange, afterwards Queen Mary, published by Sir John Dalrymple. Queen Anne's descriptions of her culminate in this invective:—"There never was a couple so well matched as she and her good husband; for as she is throughout in all her actions the greatest jade that ever was, so he is the subtlest, workingest [sic] villain that ever was on the earth."

THOMAS'S HUMAN LONGEVITY.‡

IF every man is sent into the world for a purpose, Mr. Thoms's purpose must be to protect the frontier of longevity from encroachments under false pretences. He may not succeed in strictly defining the boundary line, yet much will have been done by him towards straightening the fence; and that Mr. Thoms has special aptitudes for the task no reader of *Notes and Queries*, certainly no examiner of the list of claims to centenarian honours investigated

* Lady Mary Sackville, wife of second Earl of Orrery; she was now thirty-four; she was sister of the Earl of Dorset, the poet.

† A young beauty, twenty-five years of age. She was daughter of the Earl of Suffolk, and married to Mr. Felton, a Groom of the Bedchamber to Charles II. She died in the following year. Lord Cavendish was in love with her (Lady Sunderland's Letters, June 9, 1680).

‡ Thomas Pelham, son of Sir John and Lady Lucy Pelham, Lady Lucy being the Countess's sister. T. Pelham had married a daughter of Sir William Jones.

§ *Human Longevity: its Facts and Fictions; Illustrated by Examples.* By William J. Thoms, F.S.A., Deputy Librarian, House of Lords. London: John Murray. 1873.

in this volume, can doubt. Both from the nature of the case and according to the rule of law and common sense that the *onus probandi* lies with the affirmer and not the denier of a proposition, he is clearly in possession of a vantage-ground; though we are not sure that there is much to envy in a position so arduous, for it is one where he can expect but few backers, even the shade of Sir Cornewall Lewis hovering round him to counsel caution, and to admonish him of the untenableness of the centenary line which it was asserted at one time that none might overpass. One might draw a picture of Mr. Thoms's cynic tub on a lonely steep strewn with the demolished cases of Geeran of Brighton and Captain Lahrbusch of New York; but about its sides he must hang up tables and statistics of the ultra-centenarian lives of Mrs. Williams of Bridehead and Mrs. Duncombe Shafto, as well as of irrefragable examples in the other sex, to say nothing of a goodly number of instances which to other than very sceptical minds appear to rest on fairly good evidence. Yet though we may not envy, we must admire, his tenacity of purpose; and candour must admit that a vast deal of methodized information and light is thrown upon a deeply interesting subject by this volume on *Human Longevity*. Few but Mr. Thoms could have persevered against so many difficulties in the form of prejudice and defective information; and, whatever may come of it or after it, his book must remain a valuable contribution to the history and literature of his subject.

It is needless to say that physiologists and naturalists have, as a rule, declined to fix any such limit to human life as Mr. Thoms would draw. Haller held that it might be stretched to two hundred years; and much may be said for Buffon's argument that the "duration of life is regulated by duration of growth"—an argument which the French physiologist Flourens uses to justify the limit of fivescore, if not sixscore years. Even Professor Owen, a chivalrous ally of Mr. Thoms in this battle, admits that the conclusion of Flourens, "that a man may, under favourable circumstances, survive the procreative period (70 years) as long a term as it took to reach maturity and completeness of ossification (viz. 30 years)," is not unphysiological. Only such an age, he urges, is "the rare exception." But it is a fact which cannot be got rid of by imputations of incuriousness or prejudice, that the medical mind in this country and elsewhere not only hesitates to reject as impossible statements as to ultra-centenarian length of human life, but also, in the person of one of the most accomplished and venerable ornaments of the profession, Sir Henry Holland, makes no more demur to the possible prolongation of life to periods of from 110 to 140 years, than Harvey, in the reign of Charles I., did to old Parr's alleged span of 152. We confess our inability to see a satisfactory explanation of this in Mr. Thoms's theory, that "the habit of receiving, and properly receiving, without hesitation, the statements of their scientific brethren as to the results of experiments, the products of analyses, the details of operations and the effects of remedial agents; matters of fact coming within the personal knowledge of those who report them, and whose evidence therefore is all that can be required," accounts for medical men accepting without evidence and against experience statements of old age prolonged beyond the term of one hundred years. There must surely be some more solid ground for the disinclination of the faculty, in its most distinguished ranks, to pronounce for a hard and fast line which tradition disallows, and which experience, though undoubtedly in exceptional cases, is apt to relax. The difficulty of the question is indeed further illustrated by the hesitation of actuaries and insurance offices to meddle with it, although it is a curious fact, brought out most satisfactorily in the volume before us, that the sole assured life prolonged to beyond one hundred years is that of Mr. Jacob W. Luning, who died at Morden College, Blackheath, in 1870, at the age of 103, and who had been insured in the Equitable at the age of thirty-six.

One phase of the controversy consists in the question whether centenarians are to be looked for in the ranks of the rich and well-to-do, or rather of the poor, whose cases are less likely to attract notice. Sir George Lewis insisted upon the absence of authentic evidence of royal or even noble centenarians, and it is undeniable that the higher the social rank, the more likelihood there would be of family records and documentary evidence to check the tendency which old Fuller notes in old men of above seventy years to "set the clock of their age too fast." Actuaries, too, lay it down that the average mean duration of life is materially greater in the families of the peerage than with the general population; though, as Mr. Thoms put it, "more in number, not in proportion, of the humbler classes become centenarians," for the reason that the poor are to the rich as millions to tens of thousands. It should, however, we think, be remembered, that another point in favour of the "short and simple annals of the poor"—of course not the very poor—being likely to produce more numerous instances of longevity than the biographies of the rich, is the presumption that a calm life, without excessive brain work, luxury, and undue wear and tear of the vital forces, is favourable to length of days. The instances of centenarianism which Mr. Thoms considers to be proved most indisputably are taken from various grades—the baronetage, and the upper, middle, and lower middle classes; but we may reasonably credit all the four with a quiet tenor of existence which would naturally conduce to longevity. As to the theory that life was longer "in the good old times"—a poetic theory which Taylor, the water-poet and chronicler of old Parr's longevity, would work out *con amore*—Mr. Thoms very properly explodes it by the testimony of Sir Thomas Duffus

Hardy that in the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, seventy years was considered a great age, and men, high or low, rarely reached the age of eighty. Good drainage, he held, would tend to increase the average term of life.

Before we proceed to examine our author's criticism of what the assertors of abnormal longevity chiefly rely upon as evidence, we may mention one point in favour of the physiological probability that human life is capable of prolongation beyond the extreme term which Mr. Thoms would allow. It is this. As Flourens puts it, "most men die of disease, very few of mere old age." The reason why the female sex contributes so many more examples of centenarianism than the male is probably the home-keeping life which women lead, their less exposure to out-of-door accidents, their habit of comparative quietude, in short. Take the two most recent biographies we can call to mind. It cannot be doubted that Dean Alford, who died in his sixty-first year, might have lived much longer had he husbanded his vital resources, and not worn himself out with mental and bodily work. And though Mr. Grote lived to the respectable old age of seventy-seven years, it is impossible not to be struck, in the perusal of his widow's interesting memoir, with the little care he took to prolong his days, and with his disregard of the dictates of prudence when exposure to the cold and active exercise were likely to aggravate his disease. It is against the grain with man to submit to the conditions which, if complied with, might greatly prolong existence, and to which his gentler mate conforms more naturally and easily. Otherwise we might have far more numerous living contradictions to the doubts about centenarianism which the late Canon Harcourt's medical man, Mr. Page, likens to "the superstition of a London cowkeeper, who said he had kept 999 cows, but that it was impossible to keep a thousand."

Not but that such doubts will be sooner set at rest if it is clearly defined what is and what is not satisfactory evidence. The five-fold list of what passes for such is as follows:—1. Baptismal certificates. 2. Tombstone inscriptions. 3. Number of descendants. 4. The centenarian's reminiscences. 5. The evidence of those who knew the centenarian as old when they themselves were young. As to the first, a baptismal certificate is not worth much without corroborative facts. In the famous case of Mary Billinge, believed to be 112 years old, its value was sadly marred by the eventual discovery that there was a confusion between Mary Billinge, daughter of William and Lidia, born and baptized in 1751, and another Mary of the same neighbourhood, daughter of Charles and Margaret Billinge, born in 1772. The Mary Billinge whose years were so many wore a mourning ring in memory of her brother William. He had been presumed to be the son of William and Lidia. Dates and registers proved him to be the son of Charles and Margaret, and thus reduced Mary's age to 91. This, however, would have been a more perfect case could the first Mary Billinge's burial certificate be shown. Moreover, in examining cases of abnormal longevity, an inquirer should get up, before searching the register, such facts as prove the supposed centenarian to be the member of the same family, and the one among two or three in it of the same name, of whom the entry is required. It may turn out that the supposed centenarian is not John Nokes *primus*, but John Nokes *tertius*, whose baptismal entry proves him to be ten or fifteen years younger than the world believes. The case of Gibbon the historian, whose brothers were all baptized by the same patronymic, in order that "uno avulso non deficeret alter," is only one of many which Mr. Thoms cites to the point. Of course a formidable check upon false statements and exaggerations of age exists in the War Office Lists, the Chelsea Hospital Records, and the Admiralty Records. We are sorry to think that there have been many veterans who have set the clock of their age hugely too fast. Jonathan Reeves, an old Chelsea pensioner, who professed to have been born in 1764, and to have fought in the American war, was proved by a search into its records to have been only 80 years of age, when he was passing for 105. By a mistaken identity Joshua Miller passed for 111 till collateral evidence proved a confusion between Thomasine and Ann, both mothers of a Joshua Miller, and wives of a Robert Miller. In the much canvassed, but finally settled, case of Thomas Geeran, which bade fair for some time to become a perfect case, the utter silence of the public records and pay-lists first shook the credit of the self-styled veteran of Seringapatam and Corunna and Waterloo. His own contradictions and explanations made matters worse. According to his own account, he enlisted in the Glasgow (or 60th) Regiment in 1796. The regiment did not get that name till 1808. He averred that he sailed with it for Madras in 1797, and fought in it at Seringapatam in 1799. But the records of the regiment prove that in 1797 it embarked from Madras for England, and that it was in Stirling in 1799. In 1801 Geeran was, according to his own account, in Egypt under Sir Denis Packe, but Sir Denis Packe was not out of Great Britain from 1800 to 1805. So much for the light which public records sometimes throw on false or incorrect statements; to which we may add that, though at first Mr. Thoms's zeal overstepped discretion when he concluded that the Army Lists and War Office Gazette had "settled the hash" of "Captain Frederick Lahrbusch," yet the eventual discovery of his name in them proved that he served, not twenty-nine years, but nine, that he never was a captain, and that he did not sell out, as he alleged, for the simple reason that he was cashiered. Before leaving the question of registers, we may note that in the case of a supposed Wiltshire patriarch the defect of the baptismal register spoiled the scent. "It is said that a former incumbent, having gone to the church to marry a couple, accompanied by a favourite greyhound, the dog was shut up in

the vestry while the ceremony was being performed, and amused himself by tearing out several leaves of the register, among them the one on which Baden's baptism is supposed to have been entered" (p. 130). By the way, there can be no worse method of coming at the truth about centenarianism than triumphantly referring to records and registers, unless you are sure of their existence. An indignant D.D., writing to Mr. Thoms from Shrewsbury to rebuke his shearing "Old Parr" of his traditional excess of years, concluded with the sentence, "Alberbury adjoins Loton Hall, the seat of Sir Baldwin Leighton, and I have no doubt the particulars of Parr's penance may be found in the church records, to which I refer all sceptics." Unluckily no records whatever of Parr were to be found at Alberbury. Of lying slabs and tablets Mr. Thoms cites several amusing examples; and he shows by that of Macklin the actor that it is possible the coffin-lid may contradict the tombstone. On the walls of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, Macklin is said to have numbered one hundred and seven years. When the vaults were examined on closing the graveyard, his coffin-plate gave him ten years less. Neither is the number of descendants in the third and fourth generations, whom their progenitor lives to see, worth much as an argument. Mr. Thoms gives instances and supposes cases which we might cap by what we have seen recorded of Warren Hastings's sire and grandsire, each of whom married at sixteen or seventeen. Stories like that which Clarkson in his *History of Richmond* tacks to the name of Henry Jenkins (though it is plain that he had no descendants) of an aged son, a more aged father, and a most aged grandsire, living together in the same house, or like that of the old man seen crying because his father had beaten him for throwing stones at his grandfather, are not necessarily incredible as far as the number of years is concerned.

More fallible, however, than any other kind of alleged evidence, is the recollection of the old person himself; and Mr. Thoms accumulates curious instances of the tendency of people to put early hearsay for precocious memory. Not to mention the case of George Fletcher, a soldier in youth and a preacher in ultra-centenarian age (according to his own account, which is examined in pp. 164-70), who used to interlard his sermons with personal narratives of a battle fought before he was born, or the similar case of Lord Verulam's aunt (p. 61), which is a good commentary on such reminiscences, the author collects several instances of old men's memory going back to two years and three months, two years and two months, two years, seventeen months, and, if we read Mr. Edmund Lenthall Swift's letter (p. 58) aright, to nine months from birth. That Cooper the Chartist remembers being well nigh drowned in the Exe at two years old, we think quite conceivable; and a friend of our own, whose parents lived at Brussels at the time of the battle of Waterloo, when he was two and a quarter years old, writes to us that a wounded officer, very badly slashed in the arm, was received after the battle into his parents' house. "I can perfectly recollect," he writes, "that for a year or so after, I used to be terrified and run away at the sight of any man with his arm in a sling, as reminding me of this officer."

That Mr. Thoms has done much in this volume to clear away worthless cases—such as those of Adjutant Peacock, who, though he was adjutant of the 88th, eighty-five years ago, and retired on half-pay in 1783, and has ceased to draw pay for many years, still has his name on the Army Lists, and like the Wandering Jew still lives to the lovers of the marvellous, and of Richard Taylor, the drummer at Culloden, and divers others; that he has dealt candidly, though still with a strong leaven of scepticism, with such cases as that of Mrs. Martha Lawrence (see pp. 266-8), where to our mind the fact is as nearly proved as possible; and that he has so sifted the truth from the mythical element in the accounts of Jenkins, Parr, and the old Countess of Desmond, that they must hereafter cease to be stock examples of longevity, will, we think, be on all hands admitted. Nevertheless, even in the three last-named cases and that of Cornaro, which Mr. Thoms ignores probably as one from beyond the seas, there may remain, after all deductions, a claim to what we have called ultra-centenarian honours; and we do not see that he has at all proved that with favourable conditions—e.g., birth from healthy parents, calm tenor of life, good husbandry of vital powers, and proper care in old age—a yet larger proportion of men and women than at present may not overstep the limit of a century.

CHRONOS.*

DR. WALLACE WOOD, the author of *Chronos*, "as he sat by the seashore on a warm evening last July," unfortunately made a very foolish remark. No less unfortunately the lady who sat by him was pleased with it, and "laughed again and again," and repeated it every time they met. This remark, he says, is the seed which, "watered" by the pleasure it gave, the laughter and the repetition, "has grown to its present proportions." What the remark was shall be given in his own words:—"We had discussed daisies, the cuttle fish, the immortality of the soul, and Platonic love; you became dreamy, and I remarked: 'It is an awfully funny world.'" If the lady were to give her version of the occurrence, we should not be surprised to find that for "dreamy" we should read "sleepy," and that she laughed, not with him, but at him. The

result, however, is equally unfortunate, for the present proportions of the seed, in whatever way it was watered, are 334 closely printed pages. Warm evenings in July are close upon us. People will again be sitting on "a large rock by the seashore," and talking about what they do not understand. The gentleman of the party will in all probability say something foolish in itself, but doubly foolish from the slang in which it is expressed. But here let the resemblance stop. Let the lady, remembering *Chronos* and its present proportions, look grave, say that tea must be ready, that the dew is falling, and that it is time to go home, or, if she must stay, let her tell the story of King Canute and the waves. It is not, of course, the case that every foolish expression that is uttered, laughed at, and repeated grows into a book. Dr. Wood points out that "the plant is our fellow-creature and our brother," and we may fairly expect to find the same struggle for existence in foolish expressions as in the seeds of plants. It may be the case that only one thistle seed in a million meets with the circumstances which favour its growth into that plant which is the delight of the animal that feeds on it, and that only one foolish saying in a million meets with those circumstances which favour its swelling out into a volume which is the delight of such as those for whom Dr. Wood writes. But still, just as the careful farmer cuts down the thistles before they get into flower, so every one who has any forethought or common sense takes good care at all events not to water in any way the foolish and oracular utterances of his acquaintances. Dr. Wood is so well pleased with the wit and wisdom contained in his utterance of last July, that he more than once refers to it in the course of his book. In one place, after he has told us that "feeling, religion, and poetry should be the lath, plaster, and frescoing of our mental edifice," he goes on "to sum up the few truths of the new philosophy." The tenth of these truths, which, in utter ignorance of the meaning of the word dilemma, he calls the horn of the dilemma, is as follows:—

Life is a strange thing. In other words, "this is an awfully funny world!" The fact is that it is funnel or trumpet shaped; the only difficulty is to find out toward which end we are tending.

We must do Dr. Wood the justice to admit that, in spite of all his great wisdom and originality, in spite of his being the inventor of the expression "an awfully funny world," he yet modestly looks upon himself as merely a kind of hodman to the coming poet. "Three grand ages," he tells us, "have found their expressions respectively in the works of Homer, the *Divine Comedy* of Dante, and *Paradise Lost*. It is thought by many that with the advent of Steam and Electricity, Music and the Novel, a new era has dawned." He goes on to add, "As past ages have produced the epics of Paganism, Catholicism, and Protestantism, so the present age may produce the epic of Evolution. I have aimed at gathering and arranging the materials; its construction will be the work of the coming poet." It is pleasing to picture to oneself the coming poet, the man who is to rank with Homer, Dante, and Milton, sitting down with his rhyming dictionary on one side of him and Dr. Wood's *Chronos* on the other to write his great work. How many more epics would his three great predecessors have written if each poet could have afforded to keep, as a mason has his labourer to gather and arrange his materials, a kind of hodman like Dr. Wood to do all his preliminary work for him! At what a rate would composition go on if the hard found every morning awaiting him after breakfast his day's work all carefully arranged, his subject prepared, his facts looked up, his similes and his metaphors lying beside his daily paper!

But we must not allow even Dr. Wood to lead us too far into the future, though in his great work he looks further into time than the Millennium, the close of the Psychological age, and tells us of that fourth and last age of "repose, death (*Concrescentia*), the great crystallization." Why, by the way, the second age *Crescentia* should be spelt with the *c* and the fourth age *Concrescentia* without the *c* we are not told. But Dr. Wood is, as we infer from his book, a citizen of the United States, and in the United States there has been, we have often noticed, as much freedom in changing the classical tongues as in changing everything else. Out of respect to Harmodius and Aristogiton, the elder and the younger Brutus, and one or two other ardent Republicans, they think it necessary to keep up a certain familiarity with the literature of Rome and Greece; but while they would have their young men able to turn the heroes of antiquity into good account on the 4th of July, or in abusing a Lord Chief Justice, they would not have them forget their Republicanism by a slavish adherence to rules. A citizen of the United States surely has as good a right as any king to break Priscian's head, and may equally claim the title of Supragrammaticus. We find accordingly in the book before us an account of Copernicus's work *De revolutionibus Orbium celestium* (sic). *Plasma* or *Protoplasm*, we are told, means "egg-white substance," and gives rise to a new science, "Protistology, Plastidology, or Histology." Sea-weeds are *algæ*, while "the compound stem of the zoophyte is composed of polypes (zooids, animals), living an associated life." But what are such trifling errors as these compared with the amazing statement that "we pass from Ramees to Socrates," and that "to the social beginnings of the Orient succeeds *Latin civilization*" (the italics are the author's). No wonder, he says, "an immense power lies wrapped in the expression." Immense indeed, we are ready to allow, when he thus sets forth all that is included under *Latin civilization*:—

What volumes of poetry rise in the mind at the words, Greece, Italy, Athens, Rome, Venice, Parthenon, Pantheon, Colosseum—those fruits of the Mediterranean flower. Homer, Aristotle, Plutarch (sic)—the Poet, the

* *Chronos: Mother Earth's Biography. A Romance of the New School.* By Wallace Wood, M.D. London: Trübner & Co. 1873.

Philosopher, the Artist! These rise upon the vision to supplant the place of the god-king, and the patriarch, with his numerous family.

Later on we find that Aristotle and Plato were philosophers of Greece and Rome, and that Socrates remarked to Cato, "Country is more than father or mother." If Dr. Wood, now that he has got hold of enough classical names to furnish him out as a Yankee orator, would study that chapter in Grote's *History of Greece* where it is shown how Socrates exposed the conceit of knowledge without the reality, he might in time perhaps become heartily ashamed of *Chronos*. Meantime, as a matter of curiosity, we should be glad if he would take occasion to inform us whether it was to the elder or the younger Cato that Socrates made his remark. The one was born, to be sure, about one hundred and forty years after the other, but happily, so far as Socrates is concerned, such a slight difference of time is altogether unimportant.

We are altogether puzzled to guess from what sources Dr. Wood derives his historical knowledge. We have seen in our time a great many silly histories, but we have never seen even a manual or a book for cramming which could have supplied him with all the ignorance of which he can boast. He is not satisfied with the ordinary "division of historic time," but divides it in the following way:—

Thus, the two thousand years B.C. would be called the Egyptian age; the succeeding one, the Greco-Roman. Instead of the dark ages we have the Arabian. The sixteenth century is emphatically an Italian age, for during that period this people gave a tone to all Europe; while the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth—the age of the grand Louis and of Voltaire—is most thoroughly French. The following seventy-five years bear no less clearly the impress of the Germanic spirit. At all events, each society and each nation must stand by itself. A state of society is a flower born by its own peculiar plant, and by no means a link of a chain. Our career of "humanity," therefore, becomes instead, a Semitic, a Latin, and a Germanic career.

Why the Greek age begins after Christ, and why the Germanic career begins in 1750 and ends in 1825, is left unexplained. This new division of time is introduced and justified by the remark that, "when you contemplate successively the epics of Homer and Virgil, and then those of Dante, and Milton, and Pollock" (this rival of Dante and Milton, by the way, like Dr. Wood's *Concrescentia*, generally has his name spelt without the c), "you are not sailing down a stream, you are jumping from one shrub to another." Whether we are sailing or jumping we do not much care, but we must really insist, in either process, on sticking to our Dictionary of Dates. There has, we believe, been nothing to compare with this learned Doctor's statement of historical facts since the days—long ago gone by—of a celebrated hairdresser in Threadneedle Street. His advertisements used to run as follows:—"Cicero and Demosthenes were the pride of Greece. The Horatii and the Curiatii were the boast of Rome. But Macalpine gives his votaries a gloss that Greek nor Roman never knew." In chronological exactness Dr. Wood might also be likened to the guard of one of the Birmingham coaches, who, when asked about the memorial of the battle set up at Barnet, replied, as the story ran, "It is in memory of a battle fought between Guy, Earl of Warwick, and Oliver Crummle, in the time of the Romans." But the hairdresser and the guard had only history to blunder over. Dr. Wood, who is a Doctor of Medicine, has the advantage over them, for he can blunder over science also. In one place he writes that Plasm or Protoplasm is brought up from "the very bottom of the Atlantic, 2,500 feet below the surface, where the cold, and pressure, and darkness is (*sic*) greatest"; while three pages further on he says that "a pressure of three miles depth of salt water" is necessary for the production of this same substance. Perhaps in the United States, with their go-ahead theories, they study Socrates and Cato, "Phideas" and Rameses before the table of long-measure, and so Dr. Wood may imagine that three miles and 2,500 feet are the same. But what shall we say of a scientific writer who pretends to have studied Darwinism, and maintains that, "as both American and British subjects might claim Alfred and Horsa as their fathers, even so the Protosaurian is as much the father of the turkey as of the crocodile?" "Pericles," as he tells us in one of his finest passages, "might have glanced with contempt at the colony of Stoics" (this is Dr. Wood's fine way of describing Rome) "on the neighbouring boot-shaped peninsula" (this is Dr. Wood's fine way of describing Italy). Perhaps, without venturing to decide where or how Pericles would have glanced, we may be allowed to assert that, however respectfully the coming poet may regard the preparations that have been made for him, all men of science and of sense will glance with contempt on such a work as this. There is this comfort to be found whenever "the knell of the universal cataclysm" sounds, about which Dr. Wood writes so much, that the flood of words will be lost in the flood of water. There will be an end of writers who string "Horace Greeley, Isaac Newton, and Socrates" together, and who tell us that "a rule that works in the digestive Archæus will work in the Psyche." There will be an end of historians who tell us that "Rome was settled by a few people—history says two—in a few thousand years their descendants covered the civilized world." Can it be the case, by the way, that Dr. Wood is somewhat confused in his mind between Romulus and Remus on the one hand and Adam and Eve on the other? It may be possible that, in anticipation of the universal cataclysm that will visit the human race, a special cataclysm has swept over Dr. Wood's mind, and thrown into utter confusion the facts which his memory retained. "The world," he tells us, "grows humbler as it grows wiser." It would seem to follow from this that any part of the world that does not grow humbler does not grow

wiser. If this is true, we cannot say very much for the growth of wisdom either in the United States in general or in its citizen, Dr. Wallace Wood, in particular. At the same time, as we had not the pleasure of Dr. Wood's acquaintance in his early years, it is quite possible that he may have grown humbler. He himself says, "There is no heat, however ardent, but that it might be conceived hotter." We might likewise say there is no conceit, however offensive, but that it might be conceived more offensive. "The child," he tells us, "believes that the cradle it lies in, and the spoon that feeds it, are the fixed order of all things." If Dr. Wood in his cradle when eating his pap believed in the fixed order of all things, we can readily believe that he may have grown humbler and therefore wiser.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF PRINCIPAL FORBES.*

THE same disadvantage to which we had occasion to refer in noticing the recent *Life of Humboldt* is unfortunately to be encountered in the case of that of the late Principal Forbes. The tripartite distribution of the work is equally in this instance, and indeed must be from the nature of the case, fatal to the unity of effect which such a record should produce upon the reader's mind, if not to the absolute consistency and harmony which the portraiture should have in itself. It is by no means easy to admit the plea put forth in the preface to the work before us, that no one person was to be found competent to describe the various aspects of Forbes's life and work. It says little for the width or depth of the culture of the day if neither in his own half of the island nor in that to which his work, if not his personal influence, scarcely less extended, there was no single writer willing or fitted for the task. Of those who have undertaken the several aspects or portions of their friend's life it were needless to say more than that none fitter could be chosen, nor can any fault be found with the manner in which each separately has discharged his task. There was Forbes's work as a scientific investigator and discoverer, with his work as an Alpine explorer; indeed, as his biographer from a scientific point of view is entitled to call him "the father, so far as Great Britain is concerned, of Alpine adventure." There is also his professional work as an academic teacher and University reformer, added to which, lastly, there is his character as a man, and his portraiture in private life, in which respect he was no less worthy of regard than in his other and more public capacities. The account of his early life, his professoriate, and his later years—in fact, the whole biographical portion, in the stricter sense—has devolved upon his successor, as Principal of the United College in the University of St. Andrews, Professor J. C. Shairp. Chapters xiv. and xv., which treat more formally of his scientific work, with especial reference to glaciers, have been contributed by Professor Tait of Edinburgh; and chapters viii., ix., and x., containing two tours from home, 1826–1839, and particularly among the Alps, 1841–1851, are written by Mr. Adams Reilly, whose well known gifts and achievements as an Alpine traveller were the means of drawing him and Forbes together into the heartiest communion and fellowship, as the manifold letters from the one to the other amply testify. The scientific portions have had, moreover, the advantage of having been previously discussed in full and revised with care by Sir William Thomson, of Glasgow University, Professor Tait's able coadjutor in more than one of the leading scientific works of the day.

Although he had not personally known Forbes before his entrance upon office as Principal of St. Andrews, Professor Shairp's intimacy with the scenes and with many of the persons that surrounded his friend in his earlier life enables him to speak as no mere stranger could of those years which preceded their intimate acquaintance. The copious letters and journals left by Forbes himself, from which selections and extracts have been made by the unremitting and judicious labour of his widow, as well as from the vast and methodically kept correspondence of friends, have contributed a mass of interesting facts and traits of character, fully attesting to the world at large the high estimate of his worth in which James David Forbes was held in the more limited circle of personal friendship. He came of a good old Scottish line, and of parents in many ways remarkable. His father, Sir William Forbes of Pitligo, a man of energy and ability, by his skilful management of the bank which he had founded in Parliament Square, Edinburgh, restored the fallen fortunes of his family. An intimate and valued friend of Scott's, he was forward, at severe cost to himself, in measures for the relief of the poet in his distress, in whose correspondence he is spoken of as having borne part from youth "in desperate and almost bloody affrays, rivalries, deep drinking matches"; their bond of brotherhood remained unbroken even when Forbes carried off her for whom Scott is believed to have cherished through life a deep and romantic regard, Wilhelmina Belches, sole child and heiress of a gentleman of the old stock of Invermay, afterwards Sir John Stuart of Fettercairn. Visiting St. Andrews thirty years later, Scott writes, "I remembered the name I had once carved in Runic characters beside the castle gate, and asked why it should still agitate my heart." Lady Forbes had then been long dead. A model of womanly gifts and qualities, inspiring the poet, as it has been more than hinted by Keble, with those conceptions of purity and elevation which so mark throughout Scott's types of female character, she only survived a year and a half the birth of her youngest child, James David, who was born

* *Life and Letters of James David Forbes, F.R.S., D.C.L., LL.D., late Principal of the United College in the University of St. Andrews, &c.* By John Campbell Shairp, LL.D., Peter Guthrie Tait, M.A., and A. Adams Reilly, F.R.G.S. London: Macmillan & Co. 1873.

at Edinburgh, April 20, 1809. Idolized by his father as the precious legacy of a beloved wife, cherished by his two sisters and three elder brothers as the Benjamin of the family, the bright young spirit of the boy seemed like a sunbeam in the old family seat, Colinton House, four miles from the Scottish capital. A love of nature and a turn for mechanics marked his bent of character from the first. Making miniature waterfalls, damming burns, and leaping brooks or drains hardly less formidable in proportion to his size than the glacier crevasses of his later years, were the recreations of his boyhood. The changes of the thermometer and barometer were kept ceaselessly under watch, and the almanack went by the name of "James's red brother." His father had fitted up for the boy a room with chemical apparatus, an electrical machine, and an air-pump. With James the latent taste for natural science soon became a passion, the strength of which disconcerted the family hopes for his success at the Bar. "Bring me a telescope, papa," was the child's reply, when Sir William put the question round the nursery what he should bring back from London. "Ah, Jemmy," was the reply, "you'll never make salt to your porridge." The boy had not the benefit of any school, being trained at home under the village schoolmaster and his sisters' governess until the age of sixteen, his weak health making his father nervous for him. Beyond the usual rudiments, what little of mathematics he carried to St. Andrew's College in 1825 he picked up for himself. From the age of ten he composed lectures, made mechanical models and astronomical instruments, and wrote sermons. An enthusiastic wish for the service of the English Church was set aside in deference to his father's bias for the Bar.

At college the tastes of the young physicist rapidly developed themselves. A series of contributions to Brewster's *Philosophical Journal* upon astronomical and other subjects, begun anonymously, before the close of his first year, was kept up for a couple of years without the faintest idea on the part of the veteran in science as to who Δ might be; and great therefore was his surprise at the youth of his correspondent, who, during a tour of nearly a year with his father upon the Continent, had kept up a continuous fire of notes and observations upon heat and cold, the climate of Naples, the eclipse of November 29, 1826, solar spots, the eruption of Vesuvius, &c. Sir David's enthusiastic recommendation gained for the youth the unprecedented honour of admission, while yet a minor, to the Royal Society of Edinburgh. Under Leslie, Hope, and Bell he sedulously pushed on his studies in chemistry and natural philosophy, together with Scottish law, from the pursuit of which, however, he felt himself freed by the death of his father, in October 1829. Instead of either a Cambridge career, for which his faint inclination for mathematics discouraged him, or "racing at the Bar for a Sheriffship," he announced to his uncle, Lord Medwyn, his resolve, much against Brewster's advice, to qualify himself for a Professor's chair as the day dream of his life. A tour to the South, which brought him into intimacy with the heads of the scientific world at Cambridge, London, and Oxford, served to assign him at once a place among the brotherhood of physicists. On the foundation of the British Association of Science on the model of that of Germany, he took rank amongst its foremost supporters, forming one of a powerful Scottish contingent to York in September 1831. In June the year following he was elected into the Royal Society of London. Recalled from a projected scientific tour abroad by the death of Sir John Leslie, Forbes offered himself for the Chair of Natural Philosophy thereby vacant. Though dismayed to have Brewster unexpectedly as a rival, he was induced to persevere in his candidature, which was crowned with success January 30, 1833, mainly owing to the very high testimonials of Whewell, Airy, Peacock, Buckland, Chalmers, Hamilton of Dublin, and a host of scientific names; Herschel, in particular, speaking of Forbes as "marked by nature for scientific distinction, if he should continue to aim at its attainment." How amply the youthful Professor fulfilled the anticipations of those who thus recognized his early promise may be seen not only in the grateful testimony of his numerous class of pupils, and in the high position accorded to him amongst men of science abroad and at home, but in the number and variety of his writings, a list of which is appended to his Life. Scarcely a department of physics but is touched by his untiring energy, and lighted up by his original genius. The discovery of the polarization of radiant heat, with approaches to a demonstration of the undulatory theory as equally applicable to heat with light, deserves to rank among the most splendid of recent advances in special science. Weak health, first developed in a violent attack of fever during a tour abroad shortly after his marriage in 1844, made gradual inroads upon his powers of continuous work, without lessening the elasticity or the ardour of his spirit. His letters and journals teem with proofs of his versatility of mind, and of the energy with which he combated physical weakness in the cause of truth. After having had more than once to depute to a substitute his winter's course of lectures while seeking health in a milder climate than that of North Britain, he hailed with satisfaction the comparative relief and repose of the Principalship of St. Andrews, to which he was nominated on the recommendation of the Home Secretary, Sir Cornwall Lewis, December 2, 1859, on the removal of Sir D. Brewster to the like post at the University of Edinburgh. Here Forbes's energies found scope in measures of academical reform, in retrieving the financial position of the University, and in the restoration of the fine chapel and collegiate buildings. The foundation of the College Hall, in emulation of the English system, was with the Principal a cherished and successful work. Dividing his terms of residence

at first with his chosen picturesque cottage, at Pitlochrie, in the Scottish Highlands, he was at length driven at more rapidly recurring intervals to Clifton, or to the South of France. Reaching Clifton with difficulty from Hyères in May 1868, he sank from exhaustion, yet with consciousness unimpaired to the close, on the last day of that year.

The special work by which Forbes made his impression upon the science of the day lay in his study of ice and glacial action. A peculiar interest was excited in scientific circles towards the close of his life by the circumstance that parts of his theory, as well as much of his claim to originality, had been challenged by more recent observers and theorists. Of his power to meet every imputation of this kind he never admitted the least misgiving, and it is the firm belief of his biographers that the papers left by him contain in themselves ample stores of fact and reasoning for the refutation of all gainsayers. The valuable papers from Forbes's pen, reprinted in the appendix, will probably satisfy all impartial judges that his theory of glacier motion was thoroughly independent of that of Rendu, even though the theory of the Savoyard bishop may, as a happy suggestion and in a crude form, have been enunciated at an earlier date. The observations of Rendu in 1838 upon the movement of masses of rock on the surface of the glacier bore no comparison with the mathematically taken measurements of Forbes in 1842 through reference to three co-ordinates by means of the theodolite. Nor is it easy on the side of Agassiz to set aside Forbes's positive assertion that it was at his suggestion, and by methods specifically indicated by him in 1841, that the measurements of Agassiz were made, it being well known that no such observations had been undertaken by the Swiss naturalist until after Forbes's visit to the glacier of the Aar. Of the value of the observations either of Agassiz or Hugi, some notion may be formed from the estimate of glacier motion having been with Hugi 244 feet per annum, and with Agassiz as much as 733—the mean arrived at by Professor Tyndall, with whom Forbes himself is in fair agreement, being from 140 to 150 feet. Another disputed point is the first observation of the lamellar structure of glacier ice. So obvious would seem to be the vertical veining or striation which runs across all ice structure as almost to preclude the question of priority at all. That it may have struck Agassiz, as that gentleman has asserted, as early as 1838, it must be hard to disprove. Professor Forbes declares himself, however, to have had much difficulty in convincing his companion that what he termed a vertical stratification traversed the whole mass of the glacier, and was no mere superficial marking induced since his last visit. Letters from Professor Studer, Mr. Robertson of Newton, and Mr. Heath strongly support this statement of Forbes.

More open to controversy is the priority of announcement, together with the scientific value, of the plastic or viscous theory of glaciers. Immense confusion has been here introduced by the imperfection or inadequacy of the physical analogies pressed into the theory. Doubtless many observers before M. Rendu had been struck with the resemblance in certain properties between the motion of glaciers and that of other bodies more or less short of fluidity. But he was the first writer, it may be conceded, to insist upon the plasticity of ice, as shown by its moulding itself to the endlessly varying form and section of its bed, the centre of the ice stream moving faster than the sides and lower bed, impeded as these were by the friction of its rocky trough. He seems to have conceived it as a ductile plastic mass, much as Forbes saw in it a sluggish river or a lava stream, likening the Rhone glacier to a "pailful of thickish mortar spreading itself out in its bed." There is in all this, as clearly pointed out in Thomson and Tait's *Natural Philosophy*, no physical theory, or true cause in nature, but just the opening out of a phenomenon verified by his scientific observations, together with his geodetic and other measurements. Forbes's ideas, as definitely summed up in his *Travels* (1843), and since known as the viscous theory, were that a glacier is "an imperfect fluid or a viscous body, which is urged down slopes of a certain inclination by the mutual pressure of its parts." The single property which ice has in common with the substances cited by him—mud (homogeneous), mortar (heterogeneous), pitch (homogeneous), water (homogeneous), to which may be added honey and wax—is that of changing shape indefinitely and continuously under the action of continued stress. The property of resistance to tension possessed by all these bodies save water, and that most commonly implied in the idea of viscosity, is one in which ice is essentially the most wanting. The infinite brittleness of ice as shown by the simple fact of its cleavage by a mere needle point is, as Professor Tyndall remarks, conclusive of this question. If ice possessed one modicum of the power of stretching, crevasses could not be formed. It is to the intermediate state of *névé* that viscosity in the truest sense applies. The substance which falls in the delicate crystal of the feathery flake, crushed and squeezed together by the accumulating snowy mass, the air pressed out as its filmy particles lose their crystalline form, passes through this intermediate plastic state to its ultimate form, that of true ice, after regelation and recrystallization. A snowball goes through the self-same process. It is to Faraday's theory of regelation, coupled with James Thomson's discovery of the lowering of the freezing point by pressure, far more than to Forbes's idea of viscosity, that physicists will look in future for the true solution of glacier action and growth. There is nevertheless in the approach made by Forbes towards grappling with and solving the mystery, as well as in the experiments and observations made by him on the way, a gain to science which it were thankless now

to dispute. If he was misled in part by a somewhat imperfect analogy, he was beyond doubt the first to clear the subject from the rubbish of pre-existent fancies or dogmas, laying a basis of fact in place of one of *a priori* assumption. If not the Newton of glacial science, he must be allowed the credit claimed for him by his biographer of having been the Copernicus or the Kepler.

THE PARLIAMENT OF 1625.*

MR. GARDINER is still at work at his own special period, though, as is but natural, he is gradually getting on towards times somewhat later than those with which he first set out. He now gives us an original record of the first Parliament of Charles the First, a short-lived body, which met on June 18 and was dissolved on August 12, to say nothing of an adjournment from July 11 to August 1, followed by a translation from Westminster to Oxford. The book is a report of the debates in the Commons during that Parliament, printed from a manuscript belonging to Sir Rainald Knightley at Fawsley, to which Mr. Gardiner has added an Appendix of several other contemporary papers, among them another report of the Oxford debates. The main point of Mr. Gardiner's inquiry is to show that the famous speech which is commonly thought to have been spoken by Sir John Eliot in the debate of August 10 was, like some still more famous speeches of Cicero, never really spoken at all. It is found, though not with his own name, in Eliot's own account of the proceedings; and Mr. Gardiner's view of the matter, if we rightly understand it, is that Eliot made the speech afterwards, from notes of Sir Robert Cotton's. In Mr. Gardiner's words,

The most probable explanation is that the speech was prepared by Cotton; that Cotton shrunk from making use of it, and that Eliot, catching it up, breathed into it the fire of his own magnificent imagination, and converted the result of the antiquary's laborious investigation into words inspired with life.

The question is more than one of mere curiosity as to the authorship of a particular speech. This Parliament, as every one knows, was dissolved by the King in order to save his favourite Buckingham from impeachment. Had Eliot a hand in this first great attack on the Duke? Mr. Gardiner thinks, on several grounds, that he had not, and that his first open opposition to Buckingham dates, not from 1625, but from 1626. Of the two reports which Mr. Gardiner now gives us that in the Appendix contains only the debates of some of the days after the adjournment to Oxford; but what it gives at all it gives more at length. In this fuller report the proceedings of August 10 are lost; in the shorter report which forms Mr. Gardiner's text Eliot does not appear as a speaker on that day. But on August 6 we find in the shorter report "Sir Jo. Eliot to take of all faults from my Lo. Admirall." In the fuller version this grows into a speech in which Eliot speaks against any further immediate grant of money, and "moveth that wee should petition to debate these things at winter," and in which he uses language about Buckingham which quite bears out the words of the shorter report:—

But I dare, in my conscience, cleare and vindicate that noble Lord who hath had some aspersions layd upon him; and that if there hath been any abuse in the fleets it is not his fault, for there is a commission for the furnishing of this Navy, which is noe new thing. It was granted, or intended to be granted, in the last Lord Admirall's time; and therefore the Commissioners, if any, faultie.

It would certainly be remarkable if, four days after this, Eliot delivered what Mr. Gardiner calls a "tremendous personal attack upon Buckingham." Still it might be so; for between the 6th and the 10th came the declaration made by Buckingham to the meeting of the Committees of both Houses on the 8th, which was reported to the House of Commons on the 9th. This declaration led to the final breach between the favourite and the Commons. In the debate of the following day the place assigned to Eliot's great speech is given to one by Sir Francis Seymour—*Seymour* it is in the book; nobody then thought of writing *Saint Maur*. Seymour's speech must have been annoying enough to the King, to Buckingham, or to any courtier. But it is Seymour's speech and not Eliot's. It was followed by a speech from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Richard Weston, and it is Seymour's speech and not Eliot's which Weston answers. This seems conclusive. Mr. Gardiner further shows, from private matters which happened between the Parliaments of 1625 and 1626, that there was no breach between Eliot and the Court in that interval. In Mr. Gardiner's words,

He came to the front of the battle far more slowly than Philips and Seymour. But he did not show himself any the less earnest in the cause for that.

Mr. Gardiner, in his Preface, discusses at length the history of this Parliament in both parts of its Session at Westminster and at Oxford. He does not acquit either King or Parliament of blame, but he holds that the Commons had good ground for refusing the further grant after Buckingham's speech. He holds that Charles and Buckingham were thoroughly in earnest about the war for the Palatinate. But his general view of the Oxford Session comes to this:—

The summons of the Houses to meet at Oxford was a resource which from the first had hardly a chance of being successful. What the Commons wanted was evidently to refuse the King's demands without showing disrespect to his person. And now that the full extent of those demands were known, they were unavoidably led to question the soundness of advice under which he had acted, and to assail the minister by whom the advice

had been given. Charles too made his proposal in a form most likely to arouse the gravest suspicion. Retaining all the scaffolding of the Continental war, he contented himself with asking for a mere 40,000*l.* to finish the preparation of the fleet. He made no sign of any intention to relinquish his pledges to Mansfeld and the King of Denmark. But neither did he make any sign of pressing upon the Commons the necessity of enabling him to fulfil his pledges. Such a position was altogether untenable. He must want more than he asked for, unless he had abandoned his designs. That he was acting without proper counsel was the obvious inference.

When we read through these debates, many things, both great and small, strike us. They are mostly points which are obvious enough in the general history of the time, but they come more and more home to us whenever we read any part of its history in detail. It is very hard to get over the shock which we cannot help feeling at the contrast between the liberal and constitutional principles of the patriotic party in political matters and the religious intolerance which breathes in almost every speech. It jars upon our notion of things when we find Sir Robert Philips—nobody then seems to have taken any pains to spell him *Philips*—on August 5th, in a great speech in four parts, in which he complains that the Protestant cause was not going on so well as could be wished in what was to prove a Thirty Years' War, winds up with a practical piece of advice, that "the best way to secure ourself is to suppress the Papists here." No doubt something tending to a suppression of Papists is just now going on both in Germany and in Switzerland; but we suppose that most Englishmen are inclined to look on with somewhat of amazement, and to wonder that other nations have not found out that there is no policy so bad as that of making martyrs. But the whole mind of the age was religious, and not only religious but theological. The first business which the House undertook after requesting the King, among other things, "for the restraint of priests and Jesuits by proclamation," was to bring in a Bill "for preventing abuses upon the *Sabbath*"—the seeming confusion between *Sabbath* and *Saboth* was no bad punishment for talking about *Sabbath* at all—and we hear more about fasts, communions, sermons, and the prosecution of the great matter of Montague's book than either about grievances at home or about the recovery of the Palatinate. The thing comes to its height when, at the Oxford meeting on August the 2nd,

Sir Robert More argued the question at large, touchinge the fallibility of grace according to the distinction of the schooles of the antecedent and consequent will of God.

After which it sounds more practical when we get even such a fragmentary report of a speech of Sir John Eliot's as this:—

Not to send for a man that by intendment should be in custody, but to comand the Sergeant to bring him forth at his peril.

Whole days are taken up at Westminster with Montague's business and with articles concerning religion, which means for the most part the persecuting of Papists. It is, however, a certain relief to find the House looking forward to a Bill for the restraint of non-residences, pluralities, and commendams, and to another Bill for the increase of benefices out of the fruits of the spoil made upon them, first by the monks, and then by Henry the Eighth:—

To the end that learned ministers able to instruct the people may be planted over all the realme in the severall Parishes thereof, which cannot bee without raisinge the livings to a convenient proportion, it is desired that the House be pleased to take the same into speciall consideration, and (if they think fit) to pray a conference with the Lords for the better effectinge thereof, and that a Bill be drawn to enable every man that is owner of an impropriation by deed enrolled to make the same presentative, or to charge it with an annuities for the mayntenance of the minister, and that the Bill against simony bee speedely proceeded with.

All this, however, is distinctly the spirit of the age, and it is not confined to any particular country or party. When all Europe was divided by a religious war, and when it was held everywhere and by all parties that whoever dissented from the established religion was necessarily disaffected to the State, it could hardly be expected that the House should shrink from what we now call Ecclesiastical Wednesdays, or rather from spreading its Ecclesiastical Wednesdays over the greater part of a Session. And perhaps this religious turn of the House is really only a part of the general character of Parliamentary matters in those days, which in some points forms the greatest contrast to the way of doing things in our own time. It is plain that Parliamentary debates were of a graver and more sober kind than they often are now. Nobody went into the House to crack jokes or to cut capers. The whole thing is solemn and serious, even to the extent of being sometimes formal and pedantic. The speeches, both of legal and other members, are crowded with legal and historical precedents, many of them going many centuries back, for there was then no date like the glorious Revolution which men could seize upon to draw a definite line at. Sir Robert Philips on the 10th of August quotes a great number of examples of what our ancestors had done in like cases; he enlarges on the safety of keeping to precedents, and with good reason in days when he could say with truth, "We are the last monarchy in Christendom that retain our original rights and constitution." Precedents are not without their weight now, but they are commonly precedents not so far back as when Philips referred to the days "when the Black Prince took the French King." He, however, laid himself open to the answer of Sir Humphrey May:—

Let no men despise ancient president[s]; no man adore them. Examples are powerfull arguments, if they be proper, but tyme[s] alter; every Parliament must be wise with his owne wisdom: hee vales more a dram of wisdom fit for the present, than a mountaine of wisdom that was fitted for 500 yeares past.

Another point is that in those days Parliaments neither met so regularly, nor, when they met, sat so long as they do now. Par-

* *Debates of the House of Commons in 1625.* Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner. Printed for the Camden Society. 1873.

liament met for business and for business only. Its time of meeting had nothing to do with any London season, nor could any one have spoken of the House of Commons as an agreeable club. Then again, when there were no newspapers and no reporters save such as we deal with in this volume, there could be very little temptation to speaking to Bunkum. We doubt whether there is anything to be called a joke in the whole collection, and very little can be meant for any purpose except really to appeal to the reason of the House. There are indeed some fine strokes of sarcasm, as might be expected in the seventeenth century, and now and then a little quaintness. As when Sir Edward Coke argues:—

By the statute of 4 Henry 4 no man ought to begg any thinge of the Crowne till the King bee out of debt; this statute is called Braynewn, which is Welch for a white crowe; they were like a crowe, ever cravinge, and for their finenes they are white. In the tyme of want and dearth (as now it is) costly apparell, diet, and lady vanitie is to bee abandoned.

Besides the reports of debates, the Appendix contains several letters addressed to Sir Dudley Carlton in the year 1626, and a draft of the same year in the handwriting of a clerk of Secretary Conway, called a Narrative of the Course of Public Affairs in England, which almost rises to be a narrative of the state of public affairs in Europe. And, lastly, we have Pym's report of the same year about Montague's books. With all reverence for Pym, we cannot help being glad that the House of Commons no longer concerns itself whether the Pope is Antichrist and whether the Church of Rome is a true Church or not.

PRUSSIAN OFFICIAL HISTORY OF THE WAR OF 1866.*

THE War Office, through its energetic Topographical Section, has lately offered to English readers the means of reading in their own language all that the Prussian General Staff has told the world of the great military problem of 1866. The solution of this problem involves that search for the true causes of the wonderful and unexpected success of Prussia which was the last work that occupied the ever active mind of General Jomini at the close of his long life. The veteran of military criticism who brought to bear on the study as much acuteness as the approach of the ninetieth year ever left the human mind, rejected absolutely the theory, which at first was popular enough, of the victory being decided by the superior education of the conquerors. Even their special training as marksmen seemed to him very properly no sufficient cause for the success of the Prussians at Koeniggrätz, where, as he forcibly put it, twenty thousand of the best shots from the Tyrol would have helped the Austrians little when they left their centre open and unguarded. In short, though provided with but very inferior means of information, since he wrote very soon after the close of hostilities, Jomini unhesitatingly ascribed the advantage gained by Prussia to the combination of a superior organization, wielded by superior strategy, and carried out with superior weapons, rather than to any one of these three advantages individually. And although he wrote thus six years since, time has done little, whilst enlarging the materials for judgment, but confirm the accuracy of this general view. Countless works have shown how splendid the arrangements were which enabled the Prussians to collect eight-ninths of their army, as soon as mobilized, ready for the march into Bohemia. The Austrian Official History has explained how backward were the counter-preparations, how hurried the march into the decisive theatre of hostility in Bohemia, and how ill supplied with means were the Imperial forces in that kingdom for the strategic object of defence. The same honestly written narrative explains, with a clearness which no Prussian writer can outdo, how Benedek and his staff were perplexed and outmanœuvred by the double attack upon their front, and how order followed by counter-order spread confusion through their scattered corps, and left the generals to be caught unsupported one by one, and so beaten in detail by their more enterprising foe. Lastly, all histories worth the name, notably Captain Hozier's own *Seven Weeks' War*, do full justice to the fatal effect of the breechloader on the Austrian morale in the first encounters. If it be not strictly true, as some critics have alleged, that this effect was so terrible that no strategy could have possibly saved Benedek from ruin, inasmuch as his troops were sure to be crushed at the points of collision, it is at least true that the single victory of the Austrians at Trautenu was only won at so terrible a sacrifice as to leave Gablenz's corps hardly in a state to follow up its fleeting triumph. None of these causes of success can, therefore, be properly overlooked. Nor can any of them be fully weighed without reading carefully what the best trained and best organized staff in the world has to tell us of the deeds of the chiefs whom it serves, and of the army which it guides, as well as of the springs of the great operations in which they at their first essay made such marvellous use of their powers.

But we are not now about to follow the translators seriatim through their task. It would be undesirable at this date to review the course of the war in detail, inasmuch as the original work of the Prussian staff has been long before the public, and the outlines of the strategy, as well as the chief events of the actions, have been largely studied from this and from other sources and are generally known. There are some interesting criticisms however made by the Prussian writer, which have been hitherto little noticed, on that imperfect conduct of the

operations on the other side which gave Von Moltke so much advantage for his combinations. And it is in speaking of these that we find it our duty to comment on what seems an obvious want in the present volume—its failure to supplement the original by the many later sources of information available for the use of the translators. It is true we have before us an official version of an official work; but there could surely have been no objection to making such additions by way of note as would not have interfered with the sense of the original, whilst they would have enabled the English reader to know where it needed addition or correction. Moreover, the Prussian history is severely brief in some parts, and the point of the writer is in such places apt to escape those who are not so learned as he in the technicalities of the subject. The strategic comments of the opening portion contain notable examples of this in their criticisms of the mistakes made by Moltke's opponents.

Chief among these errors lies that which led the Austrians to concentrate so far from the Bohemian frontier as Olmütz. This has been declared, we are told, by Austrian writers to have "held Prussia in doubt, and compelled her to divide her forces." It had, as the Prussian author shows, just the opposite effect; for when it was known that the enemy were not collecting in Bohemia at all, all the first natural fear vanished of a sudden advance from the projecting angle of that kingdom northward on Berlin, such as might well have suggested itself to so bold a leader as Benedek. The Austrians were plainly either going to take altogether a defensive line, or they were preparing to invade Southern Silesia, the nearest portion of the Prussian territory to them. As Moltke had resolved to use the five lines of railroad open to him whereby to attack Bohemia, one wing of his forces—the Second Army, in fact, under the Crown Prince—would naturally move from the Silesian side; and if Silesia were invaded first, this would be sufficient for the moment to check any rapid advance of even the whole of Benedek's army. "Every doubt vanished," as the translators justly render the terse expression of the original, which, however, hardly explains itself to the general reader. "An invasion of Prussian territory could not be directed against Silesia. Corresponding measures were taken, and no care was hereafter requisite for the security of Berlin."

Few as the words are, they remind us forcibly of the vast change of opinion as to Prussian military power which has come about in a short seven years not only among outsiders, but among Prussians themselves. We have vivid recollections of a certain number of *Kladderadatsch* much gazed at by peaceful citizens in the days of which we speak, wherein the immediate consequences of the unnecessary and dangerous hostilities into which "the man of blood and iron" was hurrying an unfortunate nation were portrayed in a cartoon representing the plunder of the Northern capital by the ferocious and invincible cavalry from the plains of the Danube. Alas for the prophecies of political caricaturists! He of *Kladderadatsch* was not more correct in his forecast than poor Leech when he, about the same time, threw ridicule on the first mention of the Alabama Claims as a mere piece of Yankee impudence, laughable, but not seriously to be thought of in any shape. Only the Berliner who still keeps his back numbers may look over them with more pleasant feelings than we can possibly nowadays entertain, if we recall, by a similar process, our delusions as to what lay before us in our dealings with America.

Another point which concerns the opening strategy of the campaign, and is here treated so briefly as is hardly consistent with clearness, is the change of plan which turned the Saxons from operating with the Bavarians on the flank of the Prussian invasion of Bohemia. It would have been well, as before observed, if the translators had aided the reader at such points as these. If we read the Berlin historian aright, he thinks that this combination might have seriously threatened Moltke's communications, since the Prussians could not afford to leave troops enough behind to hold Saxony against it. But the fact is that the Bavarians were not only rather unwilling to go so far from their own country, and leave it open to the enemy's enterprise, but they were altogether too behindhand for any such daring combination. In fact, they now paid the penalty of their inferior peace organization, for they were only able to move at all, and that with a much smaller force than had been estimated, when the Hanoverians who had counted on their aid were disarmed on the one side, and the Prussians had poured into Bohemia on the other. Hence the change of the first bold design, and their subsequent isolation, whilst the Saxons were not only unable to attempt to hold or recover their little kingdom, but became a mere unit in the hurried and disorderly combinations with which Benedek in vain strove to ward off Moltke's well-aimed and decisive attack.

Whilst we are on this subject of the opening strategy, it is well to add that another point which might with advantage have been more brought to light is the preponderating effect that a superior railroad system gave to the Prussian design. It is true that the Berlin writer notices this very briefly, in order to say that it counteracted the "important advantage Austria had gained in preparation." But the translators had the Austrian official narrative available, and it could not have been beside their work to show that this supposed advantage never really existed at all. Or, if this were omitted in deference to Prussian authority, a note—and notes have not been altogether avoided—would have been well bestowed in making clear to the lay reader the extraordinary disadvantage which was entailed on the Austrians in the defence of Bohemia by the fact that they had provided but a single railroad to Prague from Vienna, and that carried so

* *The Campaign of 1866 in Germany*. Compiled by the Department of Military History of the Prussian Staff. Translated by Colonel von Wright and Captain H. M. Hozier for the War Office.

near to the frontier as to be hardly available with safety. Never perhaps, in the case of so warlike a Power as Austria, with so natural, so certain an enemy to contend with, has there been such a striking instance of the want of proper forethought. It damaged her chances from the very first; for, on account of this deficiency, a point of concentration near Vienna had to be chosen, and the defence of Bohemia left until it was attacked; whereupon Benedek's army was hurried up to the scene, and brought into action by detachments without full preparation or even proper time to develop its front in its new position. This defective supply of railroads, in fact, weighted Austria from the very first, as Prussia's splendid system gave her chiefs the means ready to hand of selecting and carrying out the most decisive and brilliant strategy that could be devised.

If the military details of the history which Colonel Wright and Captain Hozier have done service by translating needed some such elucidation as these instances seem to show, the political portion at the opening cannot by any such aid be made of value. A staff officer writing in the War Office of a great and victorious military Power about the causes which first forced his country to take up arms must excuse us if we do not follow him in his historical views. The time has not yet come when any member of his profession could afford to state the simple truth that the whole of the Schleswig-Holstein complication, with the quarrel with Austria which grew out of it, was merely a drama of puppets in which the master-hand of Bismarck was never off the strings. No doubt nothing in such a case succeeds like success; and the success of the great Minister has converted the most unwilling of the former opponents of his daring policy. Yet the fact remains that in his own land, before victory popularized the War of 1866, its real author was both openly named and openly condemned by the mass of his countrymen, who had measured with less certain eye than his the forces that were coming into conflict, and dreaded the results as possibly the ruin of themselves and their kingdom. In truth, the English reader may well skip all that portion of the book which treats of Austrian conduct, as of no more value than the estimate of a Ministerial measure by a steady Opposition journal. The great facts remain in any case, that the collision had been coming on for a century or more, and that all that man could do was to retard or hasten it. Bismarck thought the time favourable to Prussian chances, and he therefore chose to do the latter, and thus to solve the long vexed question of the supremacy of Germany.

As we part from our translators we must add that their work, except it be in the too close adherence to a now old text, is ably and fairly done. There are some minor slips, however, which are less excusable in scholars of standing than in the newspaper writers who occasionally would almost seem to have been followed instead of corrected. We notice especially that the misleading title of "*Feldzeugmeister*" which vexed the souls of so many Special Correspondents during the war, still cleaves to Benedek, although the translators should surely be aware that it is the mere equivalent of our "full" general, and should be so rendered. The Austrian *Feldmarschall Lieutenant* is but a lieutenant-general, and should not appear in a translation worthy of the name as "lieutenant field-marshal." Nor are such decided Germanicisms as the "Commanding General of the Corps" at all desirable additions to our military nomenclature, whilst they here and there give a needless stiffness to what is on the whole a faithful and spirited version of a very valuable work. The new War Office volume, though certainly not perfect, should find a place in every library in which military men have an interest. We may add that the admirable atlas of plans which accompanies it, taken from that prepared by the Prussian Engineers for their own government, is of itself a temptation to every student of the war to possess himself of this masterly history of it.

ROBERT ORD'S ATONEMENT.*

IF *Robert Ord's Atonement* had been stronger in tone and less sickly sweet in handling, it would have been a noteworthy book. It has a good central idea which might have been wrought into a striking plot; but, though not wanting in a tender kind of pre-Raffaellite beauty, it is spoilt by its overflowing sentimentalism, and by a certain silliness of treatment irresistibly suggestive of a boarding-school young Miss in her teens. The book is of the kind which thinks to make women interesting by describing how they slide their little hands into the bigger palms of men, not their brothers or husbands, when they want to coax and soften them, as women with self-respect never do; how their rosy lips quiver or pout, dimple into smiles or "come down at the corners like a child's," when they are distressed or delighted—and they always are being distressed or delighted in a bubbling, unresting way fatiguing even to read of; how their big eyes fill up with tears upon small provocation or no provocation at all, self-control being a virtue not much cultivated in these romantic regions; how they sob themselves to sleep over their miseries, with the infallible result of swollen noses and puffy eyelids, which, however, are results never catalogued; and how they accept all that happens to them in a frail, tottering infantile way that shall ensure men's compassion and attention, and that is for the most part met by a strong arm wound round a slender

waist, a golden head nestled into a broad chest, a vocabulary of tender epithets, and more kissing than careful mothers would deem wholesome for their daughters. That is, it is of the kind which has no more to do with common sense than it has with algebra, and which describes a society made up of beings as little like the everyday men and women of Great Britain and Ireland as the fairies of Mr. Gilbert's *Wicked World* are like the girls of the period in the real one.

That a crabbed old woman should resent the surly pride of an ill-tempered nephew, and cancel the will which had made him her heir in favour of a lady companion, all honey and butter, is by no means an impossible proceeding. Crabbed old women have done such things before now and will again; and Rotha Maturin is not the first lady companion who has played cuckoo, voluntarily or involuntarily, in a family nest. That the dispossessed family should feel generally aggrieved and be disposed to resent their wrongs on the cuckoo is natural; and that the designated heir, who had been waiting for his inheritance to marry, and who now finds himself deprived of both money and wife, should feel himself specially defrauded, and with greater wrongs to resent than any one else, is also natural. We will concede, too, that the lady companion who, by the terms of the will, is forced to live at the very gates of the angry family, should do all in her power to repair the injustice of her benefactress, and to conciliate her wrathful neighbours. But that a man fond of calling himself perpetually a gentleman should have proved himself such a boor as Robert Ord, and that a woman should have met his brutality with such unwearied patience as did Rotha Maturin—that the one should have been so ruffianly, the other so saintly—is as much beyond the limits of ordinary good-breeding on the one side as of ordinary human nature on the other. This excess of Griselda-like virtue, coupled with a certain cloying sweetness of impersonation, renders Rotha one of the most wearisome, if estimable, young women we have met with in that unreal world of fiction where everything gets its representative but nature.

The story is told chiefly in conversations founded on insignificant events. The plot indeed is as slender as a hair, and the very simplicity of material employed renders the book both confusing and soporific. When the interest has to be kept awake by nothing more exciting than an elaborate description of a country tea party given by one of the dispossessed to the cuckoo as his atonement, or a day's shopping when the heiress plays the part of a good fairy and buys clothes for the vicar's family, the reader may be forgiven if he skips half the talk and goes to sleep over the other half. And yet, in spite of its silliness and dulness of treatment, the book has the merit of an idea which ought to have been strong enough to ensure success. Rotha Maturin would have been a real heroine had she been a woman made of flesh and blood, and not merely an alabaster Madonna or wax-work saint. A stronger and as sweet a natured woman would also, like herself, have done her best to make friends with the angry family, and to lighten their disappointment in every way possible to her. But she would have had a little more fibre and mental dignity in her method than Rotha shows. She would not have been so like a large kitten in her manners; not so fond of sitting on the floor at folks' feet, nor have been so often taken into people's arms as if she had been a baby or a doll. She would not have been always creeping here, or drawing herself up there, with a self-consciousness that never sleeps; she would not have cried so often, have kissed so much, or have made such ceaseless play with her eyes and lips; she would have won esteem by the quiet dignity and native force of her character, and she would not have coaxed herself into forgiveness and belief so much as she would have earned respect, and through respect the "atonement" which came at last. As it is, if anything could have justified the Ord family in their enmity, founded on their very natural suspicion that the lady companion had been an *intrigante*, and had got round the old tennant for her own purposes, it would have been the seraphic superhumanity of the reluctant heiress when she comes into possession, the pains she takes to prove that she could not have manoeuvred for a legacy of which she does not make half the personal use she might, and her last naive confession that she is saving all for *him*—him being Robert Ord, her bitter and unforgiving enemy.

The Ord family themselves are well drawn; but, just as the conversations remind us, at a great distance, of Mr. Trollope, so do the men who play such an important part in Rotha Maturin's life bring to us a far-off and subdued echo of Mr. Henry Kingsley. Fortunately for the author of this book the echo is both far-off and subdued, but it is there. The heavy-shouldered, ponderous vicar, with his small stipend and growing boys, a trifle stupid in worldly wisdom, if good and hard working and properly "high," is a figure that has vitality, and can be realized. Garton is perhaps less vivid, because more complex in intention. The queer shambling "half boy, half monk," who had no ambition but to become a priest and his brother's curate, living in a cottage with "Rube"—who is a village boy afflicted with a drunken father, and Garton's special pet and favourite—and lame Johnnie Forbes, who is another village boy, scarcely prepares one for the passionate lover into which he is transformed by the power of Rotha's charms—and offer. For Rotha, to carry out the line of child-likeness on which she is constructed, will not let Garton go away from Bryn when he has the chance, but says, "Don't go, Garton; I want you," and so keeps him for a brief season as her affianced lover. And, by way of showing young ladies with money how they can persuade young gentlemen without to take the manage-

* *Robert Ord's Atonement*. A Novel. By the Author of "*Barbara Heathcote's Trial*," "*Wee Wife*," &c. 3 vols. London: Tinsley Brothers. 1873.

ment of it, and of themselves, we will extract the scene; it may be useful:—

"Why should you go?" faltered Rotha. How pale her face was! "Hush, you must not tempt me; how can you, knowing what you know now. Of course I must go away; how can I bear to live on here, and see you every day, and know," and his voice trembled, "and know you are not for me." He paused, and then went on, "You must not be sorry now I have told you this. I could not help it. I could not indeed. God bless you, dear, for your noble thought, as I shall bid God bless you in my prayers when I am far away."

The little hand trembled out to him again from the folds of the grey dress; there were tears in the bright kind eyes; the sweet face was covered with blushes.

"Don't go, Garton; I want you." And then in a voice of intense feeling, "I was a poor girl, without a friend but Meg in the world, till all these good things came to me; but what are they worth—what is anything worth—unless I may share them with those I love?"

Could he mistake those brave tender words? The strong man trembled like a child when he heard them.

"Rotha, do you mean me?" he whispered; and Rotha, looking up with a smile and a blush said, "Yes."

Unfortunately, however, Rotha's good intentions are defeated, and she does not marry Garton after all; but, when they have "passed over two graves" to get to each other, her old unbelieveing enemy Robert. Robert is the most hazy of the three brothers. One would not know whether he is intended to be a fine fellow with a bad temper, or a bad fellow with the potentiality of good, unless we were instructed by the author; but we find that we are to accept him as the former, though he certainly has a vile temper, and forgets, not only his gentleness, but his manliness more than once. However, he makes all due atonement at the end by loving the pretty cuckoo with almost more passion than his youngest brother had shown. It was a mercy in disguise, all things considered, that his aunt made the will she did. By it he was prevented from marrying Belle; and Belle in consequence conveniently dies, when he gets Rotha. He did not love poor Belle; they did not suit each other; and her temper was in its own way as bad as his. His gradual love for Rotha under the grey of hate is well described, so far as it is described at all; but it might have been made of more interest. This gradual growth of feeling is an excellent instrument in the hands of an author, and always fascinates a reader, because affording room for speculation as to how it will turn out, and what it all means. But we scarcely like the transfer of Rotha's affections so decidedly. Her love for Garton was too passionate in its grief when she hears that he has gone down with the vessel, for her to have been able to have loved Robert as she does; even after five years. The only consolation we have is that she could not have loved Garton so much as the author says. She might have liked him as her brother, and been fond of his society, and have missed him when he went, and have felt all that vague affectionateness which is half instinct and half propinquity; but she would have had misgivings, and in her passion she would have had discretion. As it is, the affair is managed with needless and somewhat uncomfortable complication; and we cannot help feeling that Rotha's innocence has a look of paint somehow, and that she is on the whole too much like a shepherdess after Watteau.

The author has committed the great mistake of opening the nursery door too often. We are overcrowded with boys, and little Arty especially is a nuisance. So indeed is "Rube," the Jonathan to Garton's David, round whose ragged shoulders the vicar's brother is always laying his arm; and so are all the young Ords whenever they appear, which is much too often. Of Meg or Mrs. Carruthers we have very little in proportion to the promise; but enough as it turns out. For, though she is begun with a firm touch enough, the portrait fades off into the prevailing indistinctness of over-sweetness; and the woman who first appeared before us as almost rugged with strength and self-control ends with being as hysterical and fond of gush as the rest. We would earnestly counsel the author of *Robert Ord's Atonement* to be on her guard against her sentimental tendencies. A certain amount of sentiment refines a story, but too much weakens it; and to have to bear company to such a weeping, emotional, kissing, and blushing set of people as those of this book for three long volumes is trying, to say the least of it. Also we would suggest that "to chatter nineteen to the dozen" is not an elegant mode of saying that a girl talks too much; and that Rotha is not charming when she says that she'd "as lief take a bull by the horns" as ask Robert Ord to let her take Belle to Ventnor. And will the author tell us what special pathos or passion she sees in the reduplication of the name in conversation? and why, when Robert and Rotha are half-wrangling together, "Robert—Robert Ord," and "Rotha—Rotha Maturin" should be considered more effective than "Mr. Ord" and "Miss Maturin," which would have been the natural style of address?

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

Nearly all the back Numbers of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained through any Bookseller, or of the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C., to whom all Communications relating to Advertisements should likewise be addressed.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 920, JUNE 14, 1873:

The Spanish Anarchy. French Finance.
Mr. Forster and the Education Act. The Scotch Churches. The Government of Combat. The Judicature Bill.
Lord Russell on the Government of Ireland. Mr. Harcourt's Motion.
Canadian Progress.
The Shah's Visit. The Dangers of the Money Market.
Old Catholics and Ultramontanes in Germany. The Science of Advertising.
Mr. Lowe and the Zanzibar Mail Contract. The Destruction of Alexandra Palace.
Orientals at Vienna. *Diane de Lys*.
The Grand Prix and Ascot.
Life of George Grote.
Todhunter's Conflict of Studies. Dorothy, Countess of Sunderland.
Thom's Human Longevity. Chronos. Life and Letters of Principal Forbes.
The Parliament of 1629. Prussian Official History of the War of 1866.
Robert Ord's Atonement.

CONTENTS OF No. 919, JUNE 7, 1873:

Parliament from Easter to Whitsuntide—The Shah on his Travels—Ministerial Prospects in France—The Trade-Unionists in Hyde Park—The Prussian Ecclesiastical Laws—Spain—The Decline of Bunkum—Lord Derby at Preston—The Judicature Bill.
The Jesuits—Arctic Discovery—The Persian Visit—The Priesthood in Southern Italy—Fish—A Manual of Dress—Complicated Complication—The Royal Academy—The Oaks.
The Duke of Wellington and the Catholic Question—Davies's Theology and Morality—A Garibaldi Novel—Letters of John Shillingford—The Great Dutch Admirals—Unorthodox London—Discipline in Foreign Armies—Pope's Illiad in Longs and Shorts—The Death Shot—French Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

CRYSTAL PALACE.—PARTICULAR ATTRACTIONS.

THIS DAY AND NEXT WEEK.
Saturday (June 14).—Special Opera. "Il Trovatore," at 5; Out-door Sports Romah, at 6.
Tuesday.—Great National Dog Show; Opera, at 3.
Wednesday.—Dog Show.
Thursday.—Dog Show; Opera, at 3.
Friday.—Last Day of Dog Show.
Saturday.—Fifth Grand Summer Concert. "Acis and Galatea," at 3.
The Fine Art Courts and Collections, including the Picture Gallery (the Works on Sale), the Technological and Natural History Collections, all the various illustrations of Art, Science, and Nature, and the Gardens and Park always open. Music and Fountains daily.
Admission to the Palace, Monday to Friday, 1s.; Saturdays, 5s.; or by Ticket purchased before the day, 2s. 6d.; or by Guinea Season Ticket.

CRYSTAL PALACE.—THE NATIONAL DOG SHOW, organized by the Kennel Club. Tuesday, June 17, till Friday, June 20.—Admission to the Show on the first day to witness the Judging, from Twelve till Three, 5s.; after Three, 2s. 6d. Other days, 1s. Season Ticket holders each day, 1s. Admission to the Palace, 1s.; or by Guinea Season Ticket.

CRYSTAL PALACE.—THE GREAT NATIONAL ROSE SHOW. Saturday, June 21. FÊTE OF THE GERMAN GYMNASIAC SOCIETY takes place same day. Admission, 5s.; or by Ticket purchased before the day, 2s. 6d.; or by Guinea Season Ticket.

MUSICAL UNION.—JAEEL and AUER, expressly from Paris and St. Petersburg, next Tuesday, will play Rubinstein's Grand Sonata, Op. 10, for Piano and Violin; Quartet, C Minor, Beethoven; and Quintet in C, Schubert; and Solo included in Programme. J. ELLA, 9 Victoria Square.

DRAMATIC READING, with Musical Illustrations, in AID of the SAILORS' HOME, Holyhead. Queen's Concert Rooms, Hanover Square, Saturday Evening, June 21, at Half-past Eight o'clock. Mrs. STIRLING will read (for the first time) Thomas Brigue's Historical Play, "Eustace de St. Pierre," with the Author's incidental Music, performed by the following eminent Artists:—Miss Edith Wynne, Mr. Lewis Thomas, Mr. John Thomas (Harpist to Her Majesty the Queen), and a Select Choir.—Reserved Seats, 10s. 6d.; Unreserved, 5s. and 2s. 6d. Tickets may be obtained of Lamborn Cook, 63 New Bond Street; Stanley Lucas, Weber & Co., 84 New Bond Street; usual Agents; and at the Hanover Square Rooms.

THE SOCIETY OF PAINTERS IN WATER-COLOURS.—The SIXTY-NINTH ANNUAL EXHIBITION is now OPEN, 5 Pall Mall East, from Nine till Seven.—Admission, 1s. Catalogue, 6d. ALFRED D. FRIPP, Secretary.

DORÉ'S GREAT PICTURE OF "CHRIST LEAVING THE PRÆTORIUM," with "Triumph of Christianity," "Christian Martyrs," "Francesca da Rimini," "Neophyte," "Andromeda," &c., at the DORÉ GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Ten to Six.—Admission, 1s.

ELIJAH WALTON.—EXHIBITION, including "A Storm on the Sea," and "A Sand Storm in the Desert," and many new and important Drawings, Alpine and Eastern, NOW OPEN at Burlington Gallery, 191 Piccadilly. Ten to Six.—Admission, with Catalogue, 1s.

BRITISH ASSOCIATION for the ADVANCEMENT of SCIENCE.

22 Albemarle Street, London, W.
The next ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING will be held at BRADFORD, commencing on Wednesday, September 17.

President Elect—J. PRESCOTT JOULE, D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S.
NOTICE to CONTRIBUTORS OF MEMOIRS.—Authors are reminded that, under an arrangement dating from 1871, the acceptance of Memoirs, and the days on which they are to be read, are now, as far as possible, determined by Organizing Committees for the several Sections before the beginning of the Meeting. It is therefore become necessary, in order to give an opportunity to the Committees of doing justice to the several communications, that each Author should prepare an Abstract of his Memoir, of a length suitable for insertion in the published Transactions of the Association, and that he should send it, together with the original Memoir, by book-post, on or before September 1, addressed thus: "General Secretaries, British Association, 22 Albemarle Street, London, W. For Section....." If it should be inconvenient to the Author that his Paper should be read on any particular day, he is requested to send information thereof to the Secretaries in a separate note.

Information about local arrangements may be obtained by application to the Local Secretaries, Bradford.

G. GRIFFITHS, M.A., Assistant General Secretary, Harrow.

CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE SOCIETY.—EVIDENTIAL DISCOURSES at ST. GEORGE'S HALL, Langham Place.—On Monday Evening next, June 16, an ADDRESS will be given by the Rev. SAMUEL GARRATT, M.A., Vicar of St. Margaret's, Ipswich. Subject: "Objections to Revealed Religion: an Evidence of its Truth." The Chair will be taken at Eight P.M. by ROBERT BAXTER, Esq., Admission free. Subsequent Discourses as follows: June 22, Rev. J. BALDWIN BROWN, B.A., "The Fulness of Times"; June 30, Rev. WILLIAM SANDAY, M.A., "Literary Criticism and Christian Belief"; July 7, Lord Bishop of GLOUCESTER and BRISTOL, "The Present Aspect of Christian Evidence."

2 Duke Street, Adelphi, W.C., JUNE 1873.

P. BARKER, M.A., Secretary.